ROMANISM AND TRUTH

G. G. COULTON

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUL 6 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX 1765 .C853 v.2
Coulton, G. G. 1858-1947.
Romanism and truth

ROMANISM AND TRUTH

First published, March, 1931.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUL 6 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ROMANISM AND TRUTH

PART II.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COMMON-SENSE

BY

G. G. COULTON, Litt. D., D. Litt., F.B.A.

Fellow of St. John's and Hon. Fellow of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.

LONDON
THE FAITH PRESS, LTD.
22 BUCKINGHAM STREET, CHARING CROSS, W.C. 2.
MILWAUKEE, U.S.A.: THE MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.

Made and printed in Great Britain.

CONTENTS

Chap. Page.

PREFACE ... ... vii.

I. INFALLIBILITY AND THE VATICAN COUNCIL 1

II. SITTING ON THE SAFETY-VALVE 16

III. THE FINAL BREACH 33

IV. DUCHESNE, LOISY AND TYRRELL 43

V. A CATHOLIC SCIENTIST 58

VI. INFALLIBILITY AND THE PRIESTHOOD 70

VII. INFALLIBILITY IN POLITICS 83

VIII. THE FAITH OF GOVERNOR SMITH 99

IX. THE ROMAN INDEX 113

X. THE IRON HEEL 138

XI. THE PRIEST'S EDUCATION 154

XII. CLERICAL IGNORANCE 163

XIII. LAY IMPOTENCE AND IGNORANCE 176

XIV. ROMANIST HISTORY 192

XV. A GIGANTIC FRAUD 205

XVI. THE SLIPPERY SLOPE 224

XVII. GARBLING AND FORGERY 252

XVIII. PERSONAL EXPERIENCES 274

XIX. FURTHER EXPERIENCES 293

XX. ROME AND THE SCHOOLS 308

XXI. JOURNALISM 318

XXII. EPILOGUE 340

APPENDICES 349

INDEX 370

PREFACE.

The delay of this second volume has been due only to my own heavy occupations and those of the publishers.

Meanwhile, no error of fact in the first volume has been brought to my notice. The most unfriendly critics, so far as I am aware, have done no more than to signify strong dissent from my general outlook, which after all is natural enough. One friendly correspondent points out that I might have continued the story on pp. 36, 37 a little further; that Rome has since, more or less furtively, come one step nearer towards the conviction of practically all non-Roman biblical scholars in the matter of the Three Heavenly Witnesses; but this leaves untouched the strange facts which I recount on those two pages.

Meanwhile, events at Liverpool have given greater force to the facts adduced in the preface to that volume concerning Roman controversial methods: once again we have what I prove on p. ix., that the coward is added to the bully. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool, with his own press, raised a wild clamour before I had even opened my lips there, and slandered me afterwards behind my back. He "accredited" two theologians to "reply" to me a month afterwards, at a time and place when he knew perfectly well that I could not appear to cross-examine them. When I offered him 6,000 words of reply, in my reprint of the lectures, for any representative whom he chose to commission, he made no answer. The two "accredited" speakers dealt, after their own peculiar fashion, with things I had never said at Liverpool; while they ignored the awkward points to which I had called particular attention. It is true, not one Romanist priest had dared to criticise me on my own platform;

they had left that to half-a-dozen lay folk who were received most indulgently by the audience, but who naturally broke down in serious argument. Yet this their absence affords no excuse for their ignoring the things which I had actually said, since there was a Romanist reporter, and the Archbishop has publicly confessed that he himself had thus a full stenographic report before him. After this, the *Tablet* continued its abuse of me, in such a style that I determined to reprint, for a wider public, tirades which might otherwise appear incredible; and, since the Editor bargained for his copyright, I paid ten guineas for that right of reproduction. All this and much more will be found, by any readers who may be curious to study the naked anatomy of Romanist religious journalism, in the Appendix to those Liverpool lectures.[1] From many points of view, this is as wearisome as, I fear, a good deal of chapters XVIII. and XIX. will be found in this present volume. But such stuff as the *Tablet* printed forms an essential feature of present-day Romanism (as represented by the hierarchy and the apologists and the journalists) an essential feature which cannot be omitted without falsifying the portrait. I know by experience how difficult it is, after a few years or even a few weeks, to trace what has actually been printed in these ephemeral journals; things which are spiced exactly to the taste of prejudiced readers at their most prejudiced moments, and which therefore explain, as nothing else can, the mentality of that public and of those whose business it is to produce What the Public Wants.

This present volume will be followed shortly by a far briefer study of *Papal Infallibility*, with special reference to Dom Cuthbert Butler's recent two volumes on the Vatican Council.[2] With that little book, I hope to have concluded controversy of this kind, which has taken up most of my leisure for the last eighteen months. If any of those whom I have hitherto vainly challenged will without delay conform to the prescription of his own Church Law, and procure official licence to discuss publicly with me any of the main points of dispute between Romanism and Anglicanism, then I will meet him, so long as he does not follow the Archbishop's device of selecting some impossible place and time. In default of such an orderly and civilised debate, orally or in writing, under a chairmanship which would command universal respect, I trust that unprejudiced readers may feel, with me, that I have already paid enough or too much attention to journalists and mission-preachers who snipe from behind their own cover, but who have never yet ventured to face cross-examination in the open. In the long run, it is only honesty that can pay; and in this present volume there are many concrete instances of time's revenges upon organised official falsehood. Chapters II.—V., and page 129, may explain the paradox that, whereas in Great Britain the rank and file of Romanists and non-Romanists are normally at peace with each other, there is no such peace in any country where Rome held all the schools in her own hand for generation after generation. The anti-clerical refuses to believe the clerical's word; and the clerical himself, when he looks bravely into the facts, often sees his own house crumbling about his ears.

---

[1] *In Defence of the Reformation* (Simpkin Marshall, Ltd., 5/- net).

[2] (Faith Press.)

CHAPTER I.

INFALLIBILITY AND THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

I AM publishing, as a companion to this present work, a volume on *Papal Infallibility.* But I must deal with the question here, if only summarily, in order to make some things clear in my later chapters which might otherwise appear inexplicable. There exist already in English, among others, two specially valuable treatises on this subject; Mr. Sparrow-Simpson's *Roman Catholic Opposition to Papal Infallibility* (Murray, 1909), and, above all, Dr. George Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church* (cheap edition, 1923, Murray). A temperate account from the Ultramontane side, by Dom E. C. Butler, ignores many most important factors.

St. Paul's Epistles, and the account of the Council of Jerusalem in Acts, afford conclusive evidence against the idea that St. Peter was recognised as infallible, or even as the final judge of appeal. The steps by which this latter claim was gradually recognised by half or more than half of the Christian Church are distinctly traceable in history; the causes were rather political than religious, and the development took many centuries. When Gregory VII. made this claim in unequivocal language, and obtained some sort of real recognition for it, he was farther from the Apostles than we are from him; a thousand years separate the earlier reality from the later claim. In the Bible, Peter is the most prominent of the twelve, yet not even acknowledged President in formal Council, nor, again, invested with such authority as would restrain a later Apostle from resisting him to his face. Thirty generations later we find this Roman autocracy of Gregory VII., which scarcely any other bishop dared for a moment to dispute. History cannot substantiate even the first and least important part of the Roman claim; history shows the living Peter as simply *primus inter pares,* and the dead Peter as rising only gradually to something much higher, by just such steps as led from the real Napoleon to the Napoleonic legend of Thiers and Victor Hugo.

And again, even though the Petrine autocracy had rested on a far securer basis, there is a deep gulf between Autocracy and Infallibility. It is characteristic of Romanist apologetics that this natural gulf shrinks or widens in response to the apologist's momentary needs. Abbot Chapman, in his reply to Bishop Gore, does his best to lead the reader blindfold over the chasm; Peter (he argues) had actually some of the attributes of an Emperor among his fellow-Christians; and, from hence, the transition is natural to the present Pope of Rome. The reader need only close his eyes for a moment or two, and he reopens them, apparently, on the Roman side of the gulf. But an acuter intellect, Fr. Martindale, in his eagerness to explode Anglo-Catholicism by analogy with Luthero-Catholicism, insists on the impassable reality of this gulf. He writes: "To my mind, nothing can better illustrate how completely Anglo-Catholics misconceive the situation, than this idea that a primacy of honour is some sort of alternative to divinely-instituted universal jurisdiction. It is no less different a thing in essence than the position assigned by Arians to the Word is different from Catholic theology concerning Him. If Rome will abdicate her essential claim, they are willing to offer as compensation something which one would say they expect Rome to find 'only a little different,' 'much the same thing in practice.' Again and again Anglo-Catholics have said to me: 'I *cannot see* why you should object so much to the position we are willing to assign to the Pope—What, that he does now, could he not do then?' Vulgar misapprehension of the whole point at issue."[1]

---

[1] *The Dublin Review,* 1924. Vol. 174, p. 60.

We have, therefore, the clearest admission from the Roman side that Imperialism and Infallibility are essentially different things, which nothing but vulgar misapprehension can confuse. For many centuries, this vulgar misapprehension was quite foreign to the Western Church. Indeed, it was never explicitly adopted, and proclaimed to the world, and ratified by a Council of Romanist bishops, until the lifetime of hundreds of thousands who are still with us. When I was a schoolboy just home from France, under the Second Empire, my father might have bought a copy of Keenan's *Catechism,* published with strong episcopal approbation, and have read aloud to me that the present Roman Catholic doctrine is "a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic Faith."[2] If he had expressed any doubt of these reassuring words, then Gallitzin's *Defence of Catholic Principles* would have told him that "he most ungenerously and uncandidly brings [Papal Infallibility] forward, over and over again, as an article of the Catholic Faith, and takes his opportunity from this forgery of his own to abuse the Catholic Church." My father himself, as a man of 27, might have read Lord Clifford's public declaration, for the benefit of those of his peers who were Protestants, "It is not an article of Catholic Faith that the Pope is infallible, even in matters of faith." Twenty-three years earlier, a Roman Catholic Bishop had spoken even more strongly: "In England or Ireland I do not believe that any Catholic maintains the Infallibility of the Pope." And the famous act of 1829, which finally removed nearly all the disabilities of Roman Catholics, and which the Roman Church has striven so hard to exploit in this Centenary year, was passed, among other reasons, because an important petition had been presented to Parliament in which the four English bishops, with nearly all the clergy except the Jesuits, committed themselves to the criticism of Papal Infallibility.[3] The Act for the Relief of Irish Roman Catholics (1793) contained an oath to this effect; and the great Roman champion, Charles Butler, comforted Protestants by reminding them that "in the oath taken by the Irish Roman Catholics they swear that 'it is not an article of the Catholic Faith, and that they are not thereby bound to believe' or profess that the Pope is infallible."

---

[2] For this and the following quotations, see, for instance, Sparrow-Simpson, Chapter X.

If my father, interested in these events of his own and his father's lifetime, had looked back into history, he would have found complete proof (as it would have seemed to him) of these assurances. He would have seen how, from the first century of Christianity until the eighteenth, bitter theological quarrels had gone on in the Church, lasting sometimes for centuries, which might have been ended in a few weeks if it had occurred to any considerable body of Churchmen, or even to the Pope himself, that he was infallible. Again, he would have found that the Irish were able to repudiate the Catholicity of this doctrine in reliance upon some of the greatest names in Roman Catholic history. The question of a pope's personal infallibility was among the main matters decided at Constance, one of the most important of all Œcumenical Councils. Even those who find pretexts for denying the œcumenical character of this Council, and for repudiating its decisions, will not venture to deny that the *personnel* of its members was one of the most remarkable that has ever sat in any assembly, and that it contained not only the highest in rank, but the ablest, most learned, and most pious among the churchmen of that day. Not only did the Council definitely decide that, in matters of faith, a General Council is superior to a Pope, but it may be said that practically all Europe accepted this decision. Gerson, the most prominent figure at Constance, was Chancellor of the University of Paris, which was by far the greatest theological school in the Roman Church; for the theological faculties of the court and the city of Rome were scientifically negligible in that age. Many historians would select him as, on the whole, the greatest churchman of the fifteenth century. He recurs more than once, in his voluminous writings, to the theory of Papal Infallibility, and repudiates it most uncompromisingly. Two centuries later, the ablest and most learned clergy in the Roman Church were probably those of France. Certainly one of the greatest theologians, and the greatest anti-Protestant controversialist, was Bossuet. Yet Bossuet, in that *Declaration of the French Clergy* which he drew up against Papal encroachments, repudiated Papal Infallibility in as definite terms as the Sorbonne (i.e. the theological faculty of the University) had repudiated it a few years before. That *Declaration* was signed by the 34 Archbishops and Bishops present at the Assembly, and by the 34 proctors of the clergy; the Archbishop of Cambrai apologising for having been brought up in a district where Infallibility was taught, and confessing that he had been completely converted by the arguments he had heard in the Assembly. In Germany, a little later, Hontheim, the bishop-coadjutor of Trèves, led a similar anti-Infallibilist movement among the more educated clergy, which was called Febronianism, from his literary pseudonym of Febronius. Down to the year 1870, Keenan's and Gallitzin's contention that it was a mere Protestant libel to treat Papal Infallibility as a dogma of the Roman Church might have been supported by the most intelligent and most learned Roman Catholics in France, Germany and Austria.

---

[3] Sparrow-Simpson, p. 100. One prelate, however, afterwards withdrew his signature.

How, then, did that strange revolution of 1870 come about in the Unchangeable Roman Faith? It was due to those whom Newman stigmatised in a letter to his Bishop as " an insolent and aggressive faction," backed by Italian influence and the sentiment of the ignorant masses, lay and clerical.

During those generations in which so many learned and pious men had rejected Infallibility, popular feeling had grown steadily in its favour, and had also carried some of the best clergy with it. The popular feeling is explicable enough; it was the natural herd-instinct of patriotism, the instinct which prompts us to deify the leaders of our own particular party. With the Reformation, this instinct became intensified; as every kind of partisanship is intensified in face of a formidable enemy, and under conditions of desperate warfare. Moreover, even the more learned clergy were subjected more and more to the pressure of circumstances, quite apart from the contagious enthusiasm of their less learned companions. The Roman Church, like every state and every institution, has constantly been driven to secure its frontier by extending its frontier; and each fresh extension must in its turn be secured by some further extension. Certain theories involved commitments hardly foreseen at first, and those commitments, again, were gradually found to involve others. Moreover, our practice often controls our theories; we commit ourselves to some action which, when questioned, can be justified only by some appeal to abstract principle which might not otherwise have come into our minds. This is admirably illustrated by a work of apologetic which earned a warm and special encomium, not only for the writer in person, but for this particular writing, from Pius X. in 1910. This is *De Stabilitate et Progressu Dogmatis,* published by Desclée and Co., " publishers to the Apostolic See and to the Congregation of Sacred Rites."[4] On p. 202 the writer thus clinches his long argument that the Roman Church has power of life and death over all baptised Christians: " But why do we require further proof for this point? Ought not unquestioned historical fact to stand for all proof, the fact (I mean) that many heretics have been condemned to death by the just judgment of the Church? It is true that mistakes might sometimes have been made concerning the faith of some individual; but the mere fact that the Church, of her own authority, has tried heretics and condemned them to be delivered to death, shows that she truly has the right of putting such men to death, as guilty of high treason to God and as enemies of society." The parallel between this claim and the claim of Infallibility is very close. For generations and centuries before 1870, Popes had sometimes behaved as if they were infallible, and had committed themselves to actions which could be justified on no other plea. Their nearest ministers had committed themselves almost as deeply; the whole hierarchy, down to the parish priest, had more or less committed itself, with comparatively rare exceptions. In religious controversy again, even those who, like Bossuet, denied Papal Infallibility, found themselves driven to use arguments which implied something very like it. Therefore, in the nineteenth century, while historians were regarding the idea as more and more impossible, theology and popular enthusiasm were trending towards Infallibility. Popes leaned to it not only through personal ambition, but in sheer self-defence; to permit doubts on that point would condemn the whole actions of the Papacy for centuries past, just as the Roman Church is at once condemned if she is denied her right of inflicting death upon those who desert her or who deny a single one of her dogmas.

---

[4] For fuller details about this and similar books, recently approved by Popes, see my *Death Penalty for Heresy, from A.D. 1184 to 1921.* Simpkin Marshall & Co.

The men who saw this most clearly were those who have always naturally been in the forefront of controversy, and who stood to gain most by the Infallibility doctrine; namely, the Jesuits.[5] They and the Pope could both count, to a very wide extent at least, on the habitual and growing subservience of clergy and laity, even of the highest clergy. Bishops and Archbishops might shake their heads, and murmur in private, or even here and there hint something of their misgivings in public; but Papal discipline was so strict that no man could long resist without being driven out of the Church; and those prelates who had the courage to contemplate this, even for one moment, could be counted on the fingers of both hands. Those who had the courage of final perseverance in protest could almost be counted (as the pithy saying goes) on one's ears. Pius IX. went no further than many preceding Popes when he acted on the assumption of Infallibility; but he did more than this. In his Encyclical of November, 1846, the first year of his reign, "he announced that he was infallible, and the claim raised no commotion. Later on, he applied a more decisive test, and gained a more complete success, when the Bishops summoned to Rome, not as a Council but as an audience, received from him an additional article of their faith."[6] This was the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, which most of the most learned and orthodox Catholics of the Middle Ages, from St. Bernard onward, had repudiated or even vehemently combated. This Decree was published in 1854. Ten years later, Pius published his *Syllabus*, in which he condemned, in effect, modern civilisation and progress. The Jesuits, with other extremists, have often claimed this as an *ex cathedra* infallible pronouncement; the majority of moderate Roman Catholics have been mainly concerned with explaining it away; but none has dared to contest it directly and openly; the Pope and the Papalists were able to count on the final submission even of those who saw most clearly that Popes could no more keep out the Atlantic than Mrs. Partington could. The very absurdity of the document, and the dismay and loathing which it excited among so many able and pious men, was a

---

[5] For this, and the general history of the Vatican Council, see especially Lord Acton, whose mastery of past Church history and of Roman Catholic politics in 1870 was rivalled only by his master Döllinger. Acton's account is on pp. 492 ff of *The History of Freedom*, 1907.

[6] Acton, *l.c.* p. 496.

measure of the Pope's absolutism in practice, and paved the way still further for his Infallibility in theory. And it is still more significant if (as Acton suggests) the Council of 1870 was, in fact, the idea warmly welcomed by the Bishops who hoped to restrain the Pope. They hoped to put some constitutional check, through the deliberations and votes of the episcopacy, upon this government by proclamation, under which the whole Roman Catholic world was helpless against an irresponsible lawgiver and an ecclesiastical police which was ready at every moment to do his bidding without further consideration. The ablest Bishops went to the Council with fairly clear plans of reform; they emerged from it a broken and discredited party.

For many centuries, Popes had been able to count on the support of a multitude of Italian Bishops, and of Bishops *in partibus,* men without real sees, dependent upon the Pope not only for their dignity and authority but even for their livelihood; men who had as little protection against him as the village labourer had against the Squire until our Ballot Act was passed. As early as the Council of Constance, Paris University scholars had complained against the numerical force of these "Italian bishopkins, ignorant of law, whose number is infinite."[7] At the Vatican, in 1870, they were still more numerous and still more degradingly dependent. The Italian Bishops had a majority of 276 over all the rest put together. The backward and thinly-populated Papal States were represented by 62 Bishops; on the other hand, the three dioceses of Cologne, Paris and Cambrai had seven times as many inhabitants, and were incomparably more civilised and better educated, yet they had only these three votes at the Council. As to the dependent Bishops *in partibus*, the Pope himself jested on the expense of lodging and feeding such a multitude; they had come to make him infallible, but they would make him *fallire*—i.e. bring him to bankruptcy. The number of Bishops, all through, was almost directly proportioned to the nullity or the ignorance of their constituencies.

---

[7] "Episcopellos Italiae, juris ignaros, *quorum numerus est infinitus.*" The point of the words italicised is that the Vulgate has for Eccl. I. 15 (where A.V. has "that which is wanting cannot be numbered") *Stultorum infinitus est numerus.* Mediæval writers commonly quote this text with a gusto which Carlyle would have appreciated. But Butler has shown that Salmon exaggerates the number of bishops *in partibus.*

The rules of procedure were deliberately framed to give every advantage to the " insolent and aggressive faction " which was engineering the Council. The guillotine, after a short while, was freely used; the greatest of the American prelates, Archbishop Kenrick, was among the victims; he could only publish his intended speech afterwards, as a protest against the irregularity of the whole proceedings. When the final closure came, 49 Bishops were still on the list to speak. Moreover, Rome was then a European State, with the Pope for ruler; the Papal censorship and the Papal police were among the least liberal in Europe. Distinguished Churchmen who wished to publish their views were refused permission to print in Rome, while the market was flooded with Infallibilist pamphlets. At the later stages, Bishops were sometimes interrupted or howled down. One subservient prelate, Mermillod, passed round the word that Strossmayer, one of the strongest minority Bishops, had himself confessed to him that the proceedings were perfectly fair; Manning passed this on to *The Tablet;* but, unfortunately, Strossmayer took the occasion of protesting publicly: " I have never spoken with Mermillod, nor even seen him outside the Council Chamber." But what can a Roman Catholic Bishop do against the spirit of Rome? As Lord Acton writes (p. 527): " They signed protests that were of no effect. They petitioned, they did not resist." Early in July, the Decree passed with 88 dissentient votes; the minority Bishops then departed under protest, leaving only two who were staunch enough to attend the formal promulgation and to record by their adverse votes the conviction that the Holy Ghost does not speak through a packed and intimidated assembly.

Of the 86 who protested only by their absence, not one had strength of mind enough to hold out to the last. Kenrick had pointed out in his speech, which he published in protest against the guillotine, that Roman Catholic Emancipation had been granted by the British Parliament on the strength of the solemn anti-Infallibilist assurance given by representatives of the Roman Church. He had emphasised equally clearly those historical facts which render the claim ridiculous; yet, when faced with the alternative of submission or rebellion, he submitted. He still held to what he had written against the dogma, but the fact that all others were yielding convinced him that "the Catholic world" had made up its mind to accept it. Bishop Hefele, the pupil of Döllinger and his nearest rival, with Acton, in historical learning, held out as long as he could; but the pressure was too great. He wrote to his old master (March 11th, 1871): "I am now the only Bishop in Germany who has not published the Decree. How can I resist when my clergy begins to rebel?" A month later he gave in; and, after eighteen months, he published a manifesto declaring his inward conversion, which "has brought back my inward peace." Several of the best historians in Roman Catholic Germany seceded from the Roman communion, and formed the Old Catholic Church, which now shares the fate of all small Churches, and is a dwindling body. Lord Acton, after very outspoken protests against the historical basis of her Decree and the methods by which it was engineered, was content to hold his tongue in public; on the one hand, he was only a layman; on the other, he would have been very formidable if driven to extremities; therefore, he was left unmolested.

But the hero of the opposition was Döllinger, who had been Professor of Ecclesiastical History at

Munich since 1825, and a "Hammer of Protestants." Slowly his studies opened his eyes to the historical weakness of Romanism, while he lost nothing of his Catholic belief. In 1861 he was still regarded as the bulwark of history against Protestantism; but in 1869, when it became evident that the plot was thickening for Infallibility, he made no secret of his opposition. The protest which he and Acton composed under the name of "Janus," though necessarily written in great haste and by no means free from over-statement, is one of the most important documents for this subject. As priest and professor at a University in Roman Catholic Bavaria, he could be attacked; his refusal to sign adherence to the Decree brought him under excommunication. But the King supported him; his colleagues showed their respect by electing him Rector of the University in 1872 and President of the Bavarian Academy next year. He refused to join the Old Catholics; but he resisted repeated attempts to break him or to cajole him. When the Papal Nuncio besought him, then in his 89th year, to make his submission as a thank-offering for Leo XIII's Jubilee, he replied once more that the Decree had been based upon "a mass of alterations, fictions and forgeries, the greater part of which had been already recognised as such in the seventeenth century," and that he would rather face God under Papal excommunication than with a lie upon his conscience. This, then, is the man whom the present Abbot of Downside puts down off-hand as mendacious, while he himself has neither courage to support his accusation under cross-examination nor the honesty to retract it as a random libel! The Infallibility question is, indeed, the main touchstone of Roman honesty.

Attempts are made to attenuate the Decree and to render it practically innocuous. The Decree itself went far, in this way, to disappoint some of its most ardent supporters. By introducing the *ex cathedra* limitation—that is, a comparatively modern invention forced upon apologists by the unpleasant facts of history—the Decree made it possible for the minimisers to empty it of nearly all its practical significance for thinking men, while it kept up the imposing façade. Not even the boldest apologist, I believe, has ventured to give a list of more than twelve occasions, during nineteen centuries, upon which these infallible Popes have spoken infallibly; and the majority content themselves with a far more modest list. It has been even possible for one Roman Catholic priest to confess "it is difficult to point with certainty to more than one, or at most two."[8] A non-Christian professor of philosophy has been heard to declare that he could find excuses, in the vague phraseology of the Decree, for accepting the Vatican definition of Papal Infallibility.

But the majority of mankind are not subtle professors of philosophy; and it is the effort to give this pronouncement some reality in the minds of ordinary people which drives the Romanist to the direst shifts, and even, as I hope to show, sometimes into downright falsehood. This is the most hopeless among the many difficulties which confront the professional apologist, or the teacher who finds himself face to face with alert and well-read pupils who are unwilling to have all their questions silenced by the mere assertion of superior authority. Whatever such men may say outwardly, and even in spite of their conscious thoughts, there must be even more strongly fixed in their subconscious mind that principle which Manning proclaimed both before and after his conversion to the Roman Church; "the appeal to history from the voice of the Church is a treason and a heresy." It was when the questions of the Pope's Temporal Sovereignty, and of his Infallibility, were reopened with an insistence which had not been known for generations, that Newman complained of the impossibility of passing for a good Catholic unless one doctored one's facts. It was in his disgust at the Decree itself that Lord Acton spoke of current Ultramontanism as a school of falsehood. It would be unfair to press those words too far; the present generation of Roman Catholics have sucked in Ultramontanism with their mother's milk; they hold the doctrine, for the most part, unreflectively and in complete ignorance of the historical objections. The rank and file may hold falsehood without unveracity; but for their leaders the case is different; and in my next few chapters I attempt to show, in detail, how truly M. Desjardins wrote when he complained that the literary trustworthiness of his fellow-Catholics was too often in inverse ratio to their position in the Church; that those who bear *ex officio*, or who take upon themselves by posing as semi-official champions, the heaviest responsibility for public teaching are those who are found in practice to be least veracious. Infallibility is a millstone round their necks.

---

[8] W. R. Carson, *Reunion Essays,* p. 91. Compare Sparrow-Simpson, Chapter XX., and Janus, pp. 403—410. Butler claims 20, but does not name them.

They lack the second factor which St. Thomas specifies as essential to real faith. In direct proportion with their possession of the first needful factor, an intellect receptive of truth, the lack of this other presses upon them; "The second requisite for faith is that credible things should be set before the believer." With few exceptions, the Romanist finds Infallibility credible only in proportion to his success in keeping it apart from intellect. In history, if he searches fearlessly, he finds the whole conception startlingly absent from all but comparatively modern times; nations behaving as though there were no Infallibility to refer to, the whole Church blundering on without any suspicion of such personal Infallibility, through such vital questions as Grace and Biblical Inerrancy and the Beatific Vision of the Saints and the Immaculate Conception; Popes themselves very frequently showing disbelief in their own Infallibility, when it came to the real pinch; the final Decree obtained through the most crooked of worldly devices.

Philosophically, the Romanist is confronted with the elementary fallacy of an assertion of Infallibility which has for its sole guarantee the Infallibility of the asserter. For, here, Pius IX. cut away the branch on which he was sitting. His assertion of Infallibility did not depend upon the vote of the Council; for the Council decided, with him, that such an *ex cathedra* decree as this was infallible apart from all conciliar votes. The world would know Pius to have been infallible, if it could know this at all, only because Pius, being infallible, could not have been mistaken in claiming Infallibility for himself. This it was, this double historical and philosophical impossibility, which provoked Lord Acton to write of his fellow-Romanists, in so far as they supported Infallibility with their eyes open, "Ultramontanism . . . not only promotes, it inculcates, distinct mendacity and deceitfulness. But those who teach this doctrine do not become habitual liars in other things."[9] Nowadays, however, it is far easier for a Romanist to shut his eyes without mental dishonesty. He stands quite naturally upon the assumption that wiser brains than his own have sufficiently proved these things; doubters must turn to the *Catholic Encyclopædia,* or the *Dictionnaire Apologétique;* there they will find that all objections are merely "old chestnuts!" But the professional apologists cannot thus pass dry-shod over the difficulties; and, for them, Infallibility is a fatal inheritance. In this volume, by a host of concrete examples, I shall try to show how the cruel force of circumstances drives these men into shifts which they would never employ in ordinary human intercourse; how frequently they verify Lord Acton's terrible condemnation, and how the very perfection of Romanist discipline, especially in externals, makes the poison work all the more fatally within.

---

[9] Figgis and Laurence, *Selections from the Correspondence of Lord Acton,* p. 43. Butler is strangely mistaken in claiming Ollivier for an impartial historian, and relying heavily upon all that he writes.

CHAPTER II.

SITTING ON THE SAFETY-VALVE.

On one point, it must be confessed, some of the anti-Infallibilists of 1870 were wrong. They feared the Decree would very much increase the conversions to Protestantism; but this prophecy has been only partially fulfilled. Its immediate effect was to drive a good many hundreds into the Old Catholic Church, and a certain number more into Protestantism, and a good many into churchlessness; but probably the movement towards Protestantism has been the weakest of these three. If Protestants and Romanists had been the only two parties in the world, the Decree would probably have justified itself; for the idea appeals immensely to a certain class of mind, and perhaps it is as potent as any other in present-day conversions to Rome. But such progress as Romanism may have made in Britain, even if we accepted the pictures drawn by its most enthusiastic advocates, cuts a poor figure compared with its losses in France, for instance, since the anti-Infallibilist days of the Second Empire. The Vatican Council has widened the gulf between belief and disbelief; and this emphasis, on the whole, has not told in favour of belief. Rome, in 1870, gave a fresh turn to the screw, and a certain amount of leakage was stopped; but only at the risk of a sudden burst. Some, like Father Woodlock, may welcome it as a truth no less certain than any others of the Christian faith. But, to others, it may reflect doubts backward upon all the rest; the connection of thought may be as fatal in these cases as it is happy in Fr. Woodlock's own. For that same philosophy which enables one man to believe as easily in the Pope as in Christ may distract many others who, finding it no longer possible to believe in the Pope, cast Christ away with him.

Therefore we may apply to this revolution of 1870 the phrase which has so often been applied to others: "La Révolution dévore ses enfants." Men are swept away by the current, they know not whither; and he who began as an Infallibilist may live to say, with Clough:—

> "Of all the creatures under Heaven's wide cope,
> We are most hopeless, who had once most hope,
> And most beliefless, who had most believed."

We have here a tragedy not less real for being, in the nature of the case, commonly concealed. The poignancy of the sufferings thus entailed, and the extent to which they are typical, may be best studied in a recent autobiography which is now easily accessible in English, and which, like Salmon's book, ought certainly to be in every good town library. This is Albert Houtin's *Une Vie de Prêtre,* of which an English translation has been published by Watts and Co., Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, under the title of *The Life of a Priest.* There is perhaps no other single book of to-day which shows so clearly the conflict between a healthy expanding mind, and an educational system inelastic in principle and based upon those traditions and suppositions which had inspired the victorious majority of the Vatican Council.

Albert Houtin was born in 1867, the son of a peasant in Anjou. His earliest ambition was to be a priest. Of his grandmother he writes: "My grandmother was even more pious [than my grandfather]. Her faith would have moved mountains. Nothing could restrain her zeal. She had it from her forbears. Often has she told me of her grandparents' fervent but coarse religion. They lived in the mythology of the prayer which the priest says at the end of mass—the mythology of the evil spirits which go up and down the world intent on the destruction of souls. The nights were full of mysterious terrors. The slightest unexplained sound seemed an annoyance produced by some evil spirit or the solicitation of some soul in purgatory. My grandmother told me that her parents believed horrible things, and that it would be better not to exist than for one's mind to be a prey to such torture. Poor woman! If she became intelligent enough to believe that God does not punish as easily and as harshly as she had always heard preached, at least she believed in a hell of eternal fire, and after a life spent in piety and self-sacrifice, her last moments were tormented by fear of the devil. My mother had all her parents' piety. My father had retained nothing but the theistical principles of his catechismal teaching. These principles wounded the sacramentarian devoutness of the family into which he had married. Thus, despite his personal excellence and his love for my mother, for a long while their union was not happy. Catholic dogma came between them. For more than thirty years—that is, until my mother's faith was shaken by my ecclesiastical experiences—the obsession that my unconvertible father would be damned caused her to suffer constant martyrdom." (p. 3.) His first master was the curate of the parish, a young priest fresh from the seminary. "My tutor's faith was of the old-fashioned kind. He delighted in the most improbable stories, provided they were pious. One day I asked him if certain miracles had really occurred. Dumbfounded for a moment by such a question, he reflected, and then replied solemnly: 'On matters so important as that God would never allow us to be deceived.' For twenty years this observation enabled me to stifle my doubts—or, in other words, my reason." (p. 6.) "Another influence would seem to have developed my emotions in the same direction: the village church, a noble monastic building, which was injured by lightning in 1921. During service I used to gaze lovingly at the choir, with its slender columns and its high windows. Such a type of architecture, soaring aloft, has its snares for certain temperaments. It inspires them with dangerous reveries. Nevertheless, though it may have suggested perilous ideas, my village church brought me a revelation of art. It associated in my mind the ideas of beauty and religion. And in certain aspects are they not connected? What is religion in its most idealised form if not an explanation of the ugliness and injustice of life, a hope that one day all will be beautiful and good? I generally took my recreation with my teacher, accompanying him on his walks. Sometimes we went along the clear and winding Loir. . . . As my mother was careful to keep me from playing and loafing with the street boys of my age, my childhood was as calm as the lazy Loir, as calm as the village, completely agricultural, without industries of any kind." (p. 7.)

At thirteen, Houtin was sent to the Petit Séminaire of the diocese, at the Bishop's special advice.

His own story shows a lad of critical disposition; and I have the testimony of a living and unprejudiced witness that he was not always easy to get on with. But it is equally certain that he was a man who thought and acted with exceptional honesty; and, many as were his opponents in controversy during his later life, they were very seldom able to get away from his facts.

After a serious illness, he began to make rapid progress. One of his masters had a liking for him, and took him, in the summer holidays of 1883, to see Dom Léopold Gaugain, then a monk of Solesmes, and later Abbot of Ligugé. Houtin was moved to read Montalembert's *Monks of the West* and the *Life of Lacordaire;* and next year, after a second visit to Dom Gaugain, he became his correspondent. "The state of dispersion in which I saw the Benedictines, far from suggesting delay, incited me to join the Order. It gave them, in my eyes, the glory of a persecuted body." He was not much distressed, therefore, by his failure to gain the *baccalauréat,* for which the Petit Séminaire had ill prepared him: "what need is there for a monk to be a *bachelier?*" He quitted the School without regret; the system had been mechanical, appealing more to memory and to docile subjection than to judgment and independent thought; yet, "after all, Catholicism represents a great ideal of universality and continuity; the obedience which it preaches is a powerful school of goodness and devotion; it preaches of necessity the great Christian ideal: 'Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.'"

In his 19th year (1886), Houtin went on to the Grand Séminaire at Angers, one of those hothouses in which the future priests are brought up to their life's work. This was directed by the Sulpicians (i.e. Oratorians, the Order to which Newman belonged) and was, like all other Grand Seminaries, "a sort of convent, shut off from the world." It was dull, but "religious enthusiasm would have made the darkest of prisons acceptable to me." "In reality, the seminary régime is more or less of a disappointment for almost all those who submit to it. But they regard all its imperfections as divinely ordained trials sent them by Providence, and they persevere. Beyond the seminary they see the Church; beyond the Church, God and the ideal the Church sets forth. Of the forty-six candidates for the priesthood in my class, only ten renounced the ecclesiastical profession after giving it a more or less lengthy trial, and before becoming sub-deacons; three died in the seminary, five entered religious orders. The others remained diocesan priests; but among them, two to my knowledge became secular clergy, after having been in the ministry for several years.[1] Although I constantly forced myself, according to the advice given me, to disregard my own judgment and to accept as the word of God what my directors said, I could not forget my aspirations, nor could I shut my eyes to certain facts. In short, I was at the seminary because I had not dared to go straight to the Benedictines. Consequently, whenever I saw or heard something that was not quite right I would say: 'At Solesmes it would be different; Dom Gaugain told me they did not think like that.' This pious comparison seemed to render my critical remarks lawful. In this way my small amount of common sense survived the prodigies of auto-suggestion which I was then achieving in order to be edified by everything—prodigies which ought to have ended by completely stupefying me or converting me into a fanatic." (p. 26.) Every morning and evening, under two professors alternately, he had an hour's teaching in philosophy. "The first was M. Ollive, a very helpful man, almost imperturbable in his good humour. Some years after my first sitting under him, he told me how he was the oldest philosophy professor among all the Sulpicians who were still teaching; and that, the longer he taught philosophy, the less he believed in it." But he discouraged questions; the authorities reprimanded certain students who raised too obvious objections, and "apart from a few simple fellows, of whom I was one, those of my year abstained from asking any explanations." The evening teacher, M. Baron, had obviously little enthusiasm for the scholastic method; whenever he could, he escaped from the trammels of the official Latin textbook and gave very interesting lectures in French. Houtin's general experience with the "Christian philosophy" of the seminaries resembled that of the man who died as Archbishop of Albi, Mgr. Mignot. "These men invent a definition, and end by believing in its objective truth; so that they argue as if they had proved the whole thing, not unlike Tartarin of Tarascon, who ended by believing himself all his own inventions."

---

[1] The original implies "renounced their Orders."

Nor were his teachers in Scripture and Ecclesiastical History more satisfactory. They were definitely subordinated to the "philosophy" course, and frankly apologetic; moreover, the teaching was mainly by rote. But the more docile pupils accepted as a providential "trial" whatever wearied or repelled them in their daily work. Of the 46 in his year, only 10 dropped off before the irrevocable step of Holy

Orders; but two, as we have seen, "se sont sécularisés."

It was monasticism that fascinated Houtin, and especially the glories of the neighbouring abbey of Solesmes, the centre of restored Benedictinism in France. He went there during his summer vacation, and, without his parents' knowledge, made a "retreat" there in September, during which his confessor assured him that he had a real vocation. His mother was delighted; his father disliked the idea, but did not oppose it; so Houtin was accepted for the year's novitiate at Solesmes. He found serious dissensions among the monks, but this did not deter him. After ten months, however, the novice-master had doubts as to his perfect obedience. "Do you feel that you could be, for the whole of your life, a hospital orderly, a gardener, or (what is more likely here) a printer?" He confessed frankly that it was not for any of these things that he had come to Solesmes; and it was decided that he should go back to the Seminary. He consoled himself with the thought that this glimpse of true Benedictine life had done much to widen his intellectual and religious horizon; towards the end of this fourth chapter, he pays a tribute to Solesmes in comparison with rival Orders. His uncle, a doctor, would at this point have financed the boy's medical education, if Albert would have adopted a lay career; but his heart was set upon the priesthood, as was his mother's for him.

By this time he was better able to appreciate the shortcomings of the Seminary course. His main manual for study, in this second year, was a book which has been thus characterised by an unexceptionable witness, a distinguished Oratorian Father: "The text book generally used is the ill-digested work of a Sulpician, written in bad Latin, and entitled *Institutiones Theologicae, auctore Bonal.* Impossible to imagine a drier and duller book. Nothing in it speaks to the heart or rouses the intellect. The great doctrine of the Church is carved into pieces called treatises; each treatise is sliced up into what are called theses; each thesis is demonstrated by three different kinds of proof—proofs of Holy Scripture, proofs of tradition, proofs of reason. ‘What could be more artificial,’ recently wrote the Bishop of La Rochelle, Mgr. Lecamus, ‘than these fragments of the Scriptures, of the proceedings of the Councils of the Fathers without any critical sense, any explanation or discussion? And the reasoned arguments—how often do they not seem insufficiently reasoned!’ Meanwhile, the unhappy pupil tries to assimilate these formulae and these texts which the professor explains more or less badly. No written work, at least in most seminaries; no study, no thoroughgoing research, not even any independent thought; exercises of memory, and that is all.” (p. 47.) Houtin was sincerely attached to Père Letourneau, who was Superior of Philosophical Studies at the Seminary. But he had soon taken the measure of all his teachers. Baron taught Canon Law; “In his eyes Canon Law for a bishop consisted practically in doing the Pope’s will; for a priest, in doing his Bishop’s will.” (p. 50.) When Houtin was confronted with the question of force to be used against heretics, he was met by the well known fact that Leo X. had condemned as heretical the proposition “It is against the will of the Holy Ghost that heretics should be burned.” (p. 55.) “The text surprised me, and I referred in confidence to M. Baron. ‘You inquire too far,’ he said: ‘I shall not deal with so delicate a matter in my classes. To enter into such questions can profit neither teacher nor taught. Later you will examine them; for you will not have finished your studies when you leave here.’ As my question was inspired by mere curiosity, I thought it would not be seemly to insist, and I did not. This system of teaching resulted primarily from a belief in the immense importance of faith. Candidates for the priesthood certainly ought to know the truth; but above all things their faith should be strengthened. The second principle effaces the first. People are encouraged to refer everything to the authority of the Church, and reason is practically suppressed."

Meanwhile, Letourneau lent Houtin Newman and other "advanced" Roman books, which began to alter his outlook. Yet there was little reality in Letourneau's own teaching. "His Scriptural knowledge consisted in a profound disdain of original texts, fortunately, as he held, supplemented by the Vulgate, of whose commentators Menochius still remained the king" (p. 53). Again: "Worse still, [our Masters] concealed from us not merely the conflict between traditional theology and modern discovery, but things we had the right to know before we could contract an engagement with the full knowledge of what we were doing. In philosophy, for example, in the first Scripture class, M. Achet dictated to us a long list of the chapters of the Bible which we were forbidden to read before becoming sub-deacons, or at least without special permission from our director. The lay world will wonder how such an injunction could be obeyed. But it was. For my part, though not lacking curiosity, I observed the injunction during the whole of my first year in the seminary. It was not till I went to Solesmes that I read the Bible right through. And for years I never read except on my knees—not a very critical position"[2] (p. 54).

His superiors must have had some hesitations about him; for they delayed sending him up for the irrevocable step of the subdiaconate. This step, however, he took six months later (Dec., 1890), and could look back upon his pupilage. "I can never think of a seminary without sadness. The motives of the youths who enter it may be mixed, but on the whole their hearts are pure, their desires noble, their wills good and strong. And what are the results? A mistaken system: the Church is a prodigious waster of strength. Moreover, the conflict between science and religion renders it more and more difficult for the Church to make use of its own clergy. What has become of my fellow disciples at Angers? How many have I known remarkably gifted who have produced no useful social work, who have allowed themselves to become nonentities. The noblest and most evangelical have been persecuted as liberals and as *sillonistes.*[3] Some, after having left the Church, have experienced the greatest difficulty in earning a livelihood. Two ended in madness; one committed suicide.[4] Having lost touch with the diocese for more than twenty years, I have not been able to follow the evolution of all my brethren. It is true that in the world also one may lose reason and honour. But the fall is not so great and not so sad" (pp. 63—4.) He had already renewed his relations with Dom Gaugain, who hoped still to make a monk of him. Twice he went to Spain, where Gaugain now was; but he was not edified. "For example, in numerous presbyteries I noticed young and pretty women, and even children, who seemed to belong to the house. I questioned the Father Prior as to the priests' morals. 'They are all married,' he replied laughing" (p. 68.)

---

[2] Menochius, a century ago, was the chief commentator studied at the central Irish Seminary of Maynooth. In his Commentary on Matt. xiii. 29 (the Wheat and the Tares), Menochius writes: "Christ does not forbid us to get rid of heretics and put them to death; see [the Jesuit] Maldonatus on this passage." Cf. my *Death Penalty,* p. 33.

So also with a Spanish Seminary in which he spent a few weeks: "During their lessons [the students] pretended to sleep, or to keep awake by taking snuff. Certainly the Angers Seminary was better than this" (p. 70). His mind was almost made up to take the Benedictine vows, when he was offered a post in the

---

[3] Followers of Marc Sangnier, a liberal Catholic, editor of a periodical, *Le Sillon* (Trans.).

[4] "He fell a victim to the discipline of celibacy: the cause of his death was known only to a very small number, and the Church, fearing a scandal, buried him with its rites."

Little Seminary of Montgazon. Dom Gaugain refused to counsel him against it; his parents besought him to take this job which would enable him to earn his own living close by them; and he accepted. His first holidays he spent in Germany, learning the language. The Superior of the Seminary was not a bookish person; when Houtin, as librarian, asked for a grant for books, M. Ledoyen replied: "Here, those who have a taste for study have no time, and those who have the time have not the taste" (p. 80). Extremely credulous, he was one of the earliest and most confirmed believers in the impostor Léo Taxil, to whom we shall come later. "He would tell his pupils, at their devotional readings, that the devil presided in person over the meetings of Freemasons" (p. 83). Meanwhile a bitter intestine quarrel at Solesmes, not creditable to either party, did much to cure Houtin of his Benedictine leanings. He had now "the dream I was to cherish for fifteen years of my life—a dream which was but the dawn of my greatest disillusion—my belief in the possibility of reconciling religion with modern thought" (p. 82). A little later, on the advice of Dom Cabrol (now Abbot of Farnborough) he became an assiduous reader of the advanced *Revue d'Histoire de Littérature Religieuse.* "In my provincial naïveté I was far from suspecting that the three priests who had founded it had lost their faith in Catholicism and in Christianity" (p. 99). In July, 1894, he was appointed Professor of History at the Seminary, but at a starvation salary. Two years later, he caught whooping-cough, and was therefore put into quarantine for an indefinite period, on his pupils' account. The doctor prescribed change of air; he determined to come to England. Next year he came a second time, and saw more of the country: his judgment of us should be read in full (pp. 94—6). He was impressed by the strength, energy and prosperity of the people; it staggered him to see "that this heretical and schismatical nation has become so prosperous," and the explanation which Abbot

Guéranger had given of this paradox seemed neither verifiable in fact nor complimentary to God's Providence. "The Anglican clergy whom I chanced to meet made as favourable an impression on me as the rest of the nation. They seemed to me to be well-bred, to be *gentlemen*." The Cowley Fathers, especially, made him feel as if he were at Port Royal: "For the first time in my life I felt that holiness existed outside my Church. . . . . My experience of the Catholic clergy was less edifying." Those of English birth seemed "dignified and sensible," but they were few in proportion to the Irish, who "generally unbalanced, mocking, choleric, vain, seemed to regard themselves less as missionaries in a Protestant country than as chaplains of their fellow-countrymen in a hostile land." "One day, when I was trying to make one of them talk about the ritualists, all he could tell me was: 'Those pigs practise celibacy!'" All these things had their influence; but greatest of all was the influence of Newman, whom he now began to read more carefully, and with other eyes: "I read the thirty volumes, and I re-read several times the *Apologia*, the *Two Essays on Miracles*, and the *Grammar of Assent*." "For me, Newman's book on Miracles was, to use Bremond's words, 'a manual of scepticism.'" It destroyed his faith in ecclesiastical, but not in biblical, miracles; moreover, he was only half conscious at the time of these dangers. In 1897, Ledoyen's health failed; he died in 1898 and was succeeded by Goupil, a far abler and better man: "the delicacy of his nature and the breadth of his culture had made him a Liberal Catholic." But at this point he deliberately stopped, and would amuse himself with cards, while preaching seriously to Houtin the religious dangers of too much reading. The other professors were far below Goupil's level. "It was curious to listen to my colleagues when by chance, during recreation or in the refectory, talk fell on theological subjects. Most of them showed a state of mind and an ignorance worthy of the Middle Ages. One day in 1897, à propos of some magazine article, I expressed my conviction that the creed, so-called, of 'the Apostles' was not literally the work of its pretended authors. This assertion seemed to them to be heresy. The professor of the fifth, M. Préalibert, one of the seniors, maintained that, before separating, the twelve composed this summary of belief, and that each one contributed an article. On the other hand, M. Lambert, a licentiate of letters, took the opportunity of this conversation to denounce me to the zealot of Solesmes, Dom Marsille, as one who was on the road to the most fundamental scepticism" (p. 102). . . . . "No layman could ever imagine how far from being intellectual are the conversations of a score of priests, even professors. Their commonplace character is accounted for, so it seems to me, in this way. Priests who have kept the faith do not generally experience any scientific curiosity, and prefer to talk shop or professional gossip. As for priests who are more or less troubled in their belief, they do not like to discuss dangerous subjects, which might disclose the direction of their thoughts, and expose them to be reported to the bishop as liberals and sceptics" (p. 103).

Ledoyen, the Superior of the Seminary, had made Houtin archivist as well as librarian; and our author, in looking through the neglected papers of the Seminary, found those of a former Superior, Canon Henri Bernier, who had been a strong Gallican and had fought against the victorious Ultramontanism of 1870. He obtained permission to utilise these for a life of Bernier, which appeared in *La Revue d'Anjou* (1898—1900). From this first publication he passed on to an article on the history of the Little Seminary, and to a biography of Couturier, the former Abbot of Solesmes. The Bishop's censor found this last "full of a diffuse liberalism"; but Houtin modified it to meet his suggestions, and received an *imprimatur*. The Benedictines welcomed this book at first; but fault was presently found with its "excessive sincerity" (p. 110); and Houtin now realised " the obstacles that *esprit de corps* may raise in the way of truth." His next book brought this out far more strongly.

He wanted to write a history of the diocese, and had been elected to the local Academy of Angers, a Society which professed to be not denominational, but purely scientific. He began his communications to their public meetings in December, 1899, with a paper on the date of the foundation of bishoprics in France. The Bishop of Angers was attracted by the title and came to this meeting. " After I had finished, Monseigneur spoke; and, as ' guardian of the doctrines of the Church '—those were his words—he disapproved of my work " (p. 112). Next meeting, Houtin gave a résumé of scholars' discussions on the subject from 1848 to 1859. This necessarily included the question of St. René, who was said to have been dead for seven years in his childhood, to have then been raised from his grave, and to have become bishop of Angers. Considering that the Bollandist editors of the *Acta Sanctorum* had decided against René's actual existence more than 150 years ago, and that Duchesne, with other modern scholars, had looked upon the matter as settled, Houtin thought he might safely decide as they had decided. But this was too bold for a teacher at a Seminary. One of his fellow-professors borrowed his MS., gave it back without disclosing his design, and then produced, at the May sitting of the Academy, a paper attacking Houtin. The Academy decided to publish both together. At this juncture, one of the Cathedral Canons lodged a formal complaint against Houtin as a heretic who had dared to impugn the legend of St. René, secondary patron saint of the diocese. He was summoned before the Bishop (June, 1900). His lordship was disconcerted to find that one of the accuser's main points did not really touch Houtin, but Duchesne. But he emphasised the authority of the legend in the Breviary, in which the story of René is told, and the extreme care taken at Rome to admit no falsehood into the Breviary.[5] Moreover, "If you do not admit the resurrection of St. René, you cannot believe in that of the young man of Sarepta nor of Lazarus. If you do not admit tradition in the matter of St. René, why should you admit it in the matter of auricular confession. . . . . I am told that you work hard, and that you rise at four o'clock; but you produce little, and this little is bad. I have read your article on the Low Seminary. Several things in it displeased me. Consequently, I have forbidden Canon Grimault (editor of *La Semaine Religieuse)* to publish any article by you without having first submitted the whole of it to the episcopate." (p. 116.)

Moreover, the Bishop called on the Secretary of the Academy and forbade the publication of the papers which Houtin had read. At the same time he learned the displeasure of the Solesmes Benedictines at his Life of Couturier. "Thus my earliest work showed me that if it is difficult to know the truth, it is still more difficult to say it." Meanwhile, the Bishop had told Maisonneuve, Secretary to the Academy, that he would suppress any publication which included Houtin's essay, or any part of it. He even confiscated the MS., and Houtin got it back only by threatening legal proceedings. "During all these discussions one point had especially intrigued me. Why did so many persons who were totally indifferent to history make such a fuss about my poor essay? Why did such and such a priest, entirely innocent of any erudition, even religious, appear more especially my adversary? In the end I discovered that certain of my opponents were not disinterested. Upon the unstable foundation of such legends as that of St. René they had built up charitable societies which increased their income; and these they were defending against untimely criticism.

---

[5] The reader will note the significance of this for the case of Pope Honorius, whose heresy was commemorated in the Breviary for nearly 1,000 years.

The patronage of St. René had been associated with a foundation on behalf of children living and dying without baptism. I was completely ignorant of this when I wrote my essay. But those who exploited it could not afford to be ignorant of me." (p. 120.) Yet Houtin insists, and with evident sincerity, that what drove him out of the Church was not his dislike of her relic-mongering or any confusion between the value of a doctrine and the personal unworthiness of any of its ministers. "In these memoirs and in my other books I have refrained from telling curious and piquant anecdotes about money and other subjects.[6] I have confined myself to generalities, and I intend to do so. Why should I dishonour priests who have enjoyed a by no means bad reputation? And even suppose I were not to mention the heroes of such stories by name, why should I contribute to a literature of comic and irreverent tales which in every language is quite voluminous enough? Many priests who have turned out badly were not wicked people; they had probably entered the priesthood with pure motives." (p. 121.) . . . "If I have not found it necessary to refer discreetly to scandals which constitute a part of the experience I acquired during nine years in the diocesan priesthood, it is none the less important to insist that these things made no profound impression on me. The faith of the young, uneducated priests is frequently undermined by the incredulousness or the imperfections they observe in their elders. My faith was too intellectual and too literary to be assailed by such things. It could be destroyed only by the fallacious distinctions and the sentimental subtleties of apologetics and by the concentration of my mind on the titles on which the Church founds its pretentions." (p. 122.)

The fact is, that the heaviest blow to his faith was dealt now by the arguments of the apologists. They insisted on comparing St. René with the young man of Sarepta and Lazarus; and this drove him back to reconsider the Bible stories. Was it possible that these, which hitherto he had never been tempted to doubt, should be as ill-founded as the René story obviously was? "The totalling up of the results of this controversy on matters of dogma shocked the prejudices which my education had inculcated upon me. In my opinion, there can hardly be anything in the world more sad than the moment when a priest perceives his dogmatic theories to be brutally refuted by a few clearly established facts. He has lived in the most perfect certitude, and then he discovers that there are valid objections to several points. He has believed that the body of clergy to which he esteemed it an honour to belong was the guardian of civilisation, the depository of all knowledge; and he finds that for centuries the clergy have, on the whole, been behaving mainly as a caste anxious to maintain against everyone and everything antiquated ideas, privileges and revenues. It is impossible to imagine anything more poignant and more humiliating." (p. 125.)

---

[6] We must make exception here for this monograph entitled *Autour d'un Prêtre marié,* which, however, was published only in 1910.

CHAPTER III.

THE FINAL BREACH.

MEANWHILE, Houtin's parents had retired from their little shop and migrated to Paris, where a brother was employed. Houtin could now work at the Bibliothèque Nationale; and his ideas widened. He wrote to his Bishop for leave to resign his professorship and live with his family in Paris, or go to study in Germany. His mother's devout faith was much distressed by the René incident. The Bishop, after much delay, forbade Germany, but permitted Paris, and granted a *celebret* [permission to sing Mass] for six months. He took the opportunity of lecturing Houtin on the danger of exploding such legends as the Holy House of Loretto. Houtin now left the Seminary for good (Easter, 1901). In Paris, he lived with his parents, and supported himself by giving lessons to a child. Finally, Letourneau, his favourite teacher at the Seminary in old days, offered him a curacy at his present church. "The appointment I was offered at St. Sulpice brought in about two hundred francs a month. It involved an almost daily fast, which on mass or burial or grand wedding days frequently lasted till one o'clock. Prolonged ceremonies often lasted the whole morning." (p. 140.) Yet, such as it was, he was very glad to get it. Here, in Paris, he soon met more than one priest who had gone very much farther than himself. Alfred Loisy, of course; but others whose names are far less familiar to English readers. Père Camille de la Croix, a Jesuit and a distinguished archæologist, confessed to him frankly how much his theology had been unsettled by his search for positive truth: "I should have been a happier man if I had not learned archæology." Others met him with the well-worn argument that truth is not always opportune; "we must have a religion for the people." Houtin comments here: "Possibly these remarks may give a poor opinion of priestly sincerity. Although in my book, *La Crise du Clergé,* I have examined the subject at length, I think I ought to observe here that the question is more complex than many believe; it is but a part of the great question of the sincerity of mankind in general. The sincerity of priests may well be compared with the sincerity of philosophers. . . . . Pascal went to the root of the matter:—'Man is nought but disguise, falsehood and hypocrisy, both towards himself and towards others. He will not have the truth told to him; he avoids telling it to others; and all these dispositions, so remote from justice and reason, have their natural root in his heart.' Will the human heart ever rid itself of this 'natural root,' or must one believe, with M. Paulhan, that 'hypocrisy and lying are absolutely necessary to all human society'? However that may be, for having always sought truth and told the little I have been able to discover, I have passed for a fool and an *enfant terrible.*" (pp. 129—130.)

The curacy at St. Sulpice began in January, 1902, and ended on the first of April. The old insuperable difficulty had arisen; Houtin had tried to tell the truth. On the 17th March, he had published his *Bible Question among the French Catholics in the Nineteenth Century,* the first of his full-blown books. It attracted considerable attention from the first; and a fellow-Sulpician in America, joint Principal of the School of St. Augustine, near Washington, begged leave to translate it into English. But "if my book brought me acceptable congratulations, it had other and very unpleasant results. On the very day of its publication I naturally sent a copy to M. Letourneau. On the very next day he informed me that it annoyed and displeased him extremely. On April 1st he told the Archbishop that he could not keep me in his Church and asked that I might be moved to another parish. The Cardinal dismissed me absolutely. When communicating this decision to me the next day, the proctor of the officialité, M. Peuportier, added that never should I be appointed to another post in the diocese of Paris. He was merely transmitting to me the decision of his superior. Some time before, soon after his appointment, M. Peuportier had had to deal with two serious cases. The priest of one of the most important parishes in Paris was convicted of concubinage, his senior curate of sodomy. The archiepiscopal council resolved to shut its eyes to the vicar's case; the curate was sent some little distance away from the scene of his exploits, and relegated to quite a comfortable post. Evidently I had deserved harder treatment than they. My intellectual curiosity was more dangerous than their violations of discipline. I do not complain of these facts; I merely note them in order to complete the picture of the Catholic system." (p. 143.) Yet, in fact, *La Question Biblique* was not a book of theology, but of history. It simply gave, almost without comment, a conspectus of what had been printed on Biblical questions in recent books, (most of which had received the official *imprimatur*) and left the reader to judge;[1] and he had stressed its purely historical character by printing as its motto a sentence from Leo XIII's letter on history: "The first law of history is not to venture to lie, the second not to be afraid to tell the truth; in addition to which the historian should not lend himself either to suspicion, flattery or animosity." (p. 145.) Paris diocese, therefore, would have no more of him, and his own Bishop of Angers recalled him. On his way through he called on the Bishop and tried to justify himself; but his Grace was not prepared for argument: he simply said: "A Bishop does not discuss, does not refute: he condemns." A friend reported to him what the Bishop had said behind his back: "When he lacks bread, he will be obliged to return."

---

[1] An admirable characterisation of the book will be found in Fawkes, pp. 50—52.

He did, in fact, vainly seek humble clerical posts. Meanwhile, in Paris, he became more intimate with others who thought far more freely than he did. Chief among these was Marcel Hébert, Honorary Canon of Bayeux, and formerly Principal of the Ecole Fénelon, who, accused of heresy, had just been dismissed from an honourable post and from the priesthood, and was plunged at once into great poverty. "His case aroused bitter feeling among his confrères; various rumours of it reached me. . . . The Paris clergy indulged even in the sacristy in talk so free and so irreverent as to be almost incredible. The affair was the object of sharp commentary. Certain priests vehemently denounced the intransigence of M. Hébert in refusing to retract. It would have been so simple for him to have saved the situation by signing a formula! Others denounced the intransigence of the archbishop in depriving the clergy of the services of a distinguished man. Others inclined to the opinion of an eminent priest who said some years later: 'If we have lost our faith we are not obliged to tell everybody.' . . . . . Priests discussed boldly, profoundly, the great question: 'Can one remain a Catholic, a Christian, a believer, without sacrificing one's reason?' Those who replied in the negative continued their ministry none the less. . . In Paris I knew priests who thought more freely than numbers of freethinkers, and who continued, none the less, to defend the Church professionally with great zeal." (p. 157.)

A second edition of the *Question Biblique* was soon called for; luckily for the author, this coincided with the publication of Loisy's *L'Evangile et l'Eglise,* which caused a far greater scandal, and thus to some extent sheltered Houtin. However, the Bishop of Angers formally prohibited the book in his diocese, and the Archbishop of Paris followed suit immediately. Friends tried to persuade Houtin to pretend submission, as others had done. They told him what they knew of other cases; how "a certain vicar-general, a certain important priest of Paris, certain eminent Religious, whose subtle arguments had contributed to form or to strengthen my belief, were merely clever actors." (p. 163.) But Houtin felt that he, for his part, was not made like that. Without retracting anything, he wrote to ask his Bishop not to recall him, but to allow him to live in Paris. The Bishop replied by refusing to renew his *celebret*. This pained him even more spiritually than materially; for "I believed in the whole body of Catholic dogma; not merely in the divinity of Jesus Christ, but in transubstantiation and my priestly office." (p. 166.) Yet the material side was far from negligible; the Bishop well knew how few of the clergy could resist the application of that screw. "According to current prejudice, a priest deprived of the power of saying mass loses caste. The public believes him to have committed some grave offence. No family will engage him as professor or tutor for their children. It is almost impossible for him to earn a livelihood." (p. 166.) Houtin, in protest, published in pamphlet form *My Difficulties with my Bishop*, in which he printed the full correspondence, with comments. The work was passed on to the Bishop's coadjutor, with orders "to write a refutation supported by a critical study of all my writings. But this project was never carried out owing to the difficulty of contradicting assertions which are invariably supported by references and documents." (p. 167.)

Friends like Loisy tried in vain to get him clerical work. Paul Sabatier made friends with him, but dropped him later on; Houtin writes bitterly and unjustly about this, but not without some real provocation; Sabatier's weakness was a tendency to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. Meanwhile, the "religious" papers treated Houtin after their usual fashion, speaking of him as an "ex-Benedictine"; and an "unfrocked priest." At last (Dec. 4th, 1903), two of his books were formally placed on the Index, with five of Loisy's, in the usual form; "Let no one, of whatever rank and condition, in whatever place and whatever language, venture in the future to publish, read or preserve the aforesaid works, condemned and proscribed under the penalties set forth in the Catalogue of Prohibited Books. These things having been reported by me, the Secretary whose name is signed below, to our very holy Lord, the Pope, Pius X., his Holiness has approved the decree and has ordered it to be promulgated." (p. 182.)

The reader should pursue in the original the steps by which Houtin traces his evolution up to this point (pp. 183—188). The attempt to write true history had gradually brought him into contact with "the organisation of pious fraud"; and the dishonesty of his colleagues opened his eyes to the dishonesties upon which the Roman claims had been gradually built up in the past. For awhile, "I had believed on the authority of learned Liberal priests whom I saw remaining in the Church: Duchesne, Loisy, Turmel, Batiffol." Intellectually, he became more and more sure of himself. "But it was in my mind alone that this tranquillity reigned. Emotionally I was shaken. I had suffered much; I was bruised and broken. As I have never dwelt on the emotional side of the crisis I had passed through, nor expressed my great sorrow in any book, I have often been represented as a pure intellectual, happy in being delivered from mythology. The truth is quite different. My emancipation was very painful." (pp. 187—188.) And, far from hastening the process of disintegration, his feelings prompted him always to retard it. "While, after many years of intense study, my mind was neither Catholic nor Christian in the orthodox and traditional sense of these words, my emotions long continued impregnated with Catholicism and Christianity. I venerated the founders of Christianity, beginning naturally with Jesus and Paul. My manner of feeling was determined by Christian and Catholic tradition. But this emotional attitude was not in the least dogmatic." (p. 188.) There was much that attracted him in Liberal Protestantism; much, again, in Judaism. He was living with difficulty from hand to mouth; his refusal to retract anything might lead at any time to his formal excommunication; but his mind was made up. He felt that he had a mission; to expose the Roman falsehoods which had done so much to wreck his own and other lives, without troubling himself as to what else might fall, with the collapse of those pillars, upon himself or upon others.

Unexpectedly, the Liberal Bishop of Tarentaise wrote and offered him a modest secretaryship for awhile. At this job, he saw still more of other Bishops behind the footlights; the details are recounted in Chapter XVI. Meanwhile, he had obtained employment as occasional contributor to *Le Siècle,* which paid him with a curate's pittance and, in March, 1905, sent him to Rome to study and report on the question of Separation of Church and State, the burning question of French politics at that moment. Rome did not shock him, as it has done with a good many other people; he took the city as he found it, and had always a soft spot in his heart for it. But he found the same religion there as in France; believers, with a strong minority of unbelievers. The Marchese di San Giuliano, who on his deathbed accepted the Papal blessing, "professed a more thorough, fundamental and persistent scorn for Jesus than I have ever found in any person save one." The Marchese Vitelleschi, himself a thorough sceptic, advocated religion for the people. He advised Houtin to humour the authorities; to write whatever he liked, except on the Bible; the books would be placed on the Index, but "do not let a condemnation spoil your breakfast; merely say to yourself that they are carrying on their trade. . . . submit, and continue to submit." "I told the Marchese that such behaviour seemed to me farcical. He replied: 'I see that you are a Frenchman. Life is a comedy. We must play it as honestly as we can; but with all our honesty we shall not be able to prevent its being a farce.'" (p. 206.) "He died almost suddenly in the following year, administered to by his friend, Cardinal Macchi, a worldly prelate and, consequently, an excellent comedian. This apparently Christian death reminded me of a saying of Prince Giovanni Borghese: 'I believe in nothing, but on my deathbed I shall call for a priest; it runs in my blood.'" (p. 207.)

Back in Paris, he published his *Question Biblique au XXe Siècle,* a continuation of the former work. The Cardinal Vicar in Rome condemned it before it was published; this served as an advertisement; the edition sold out in a month, and was followed at once by a second, which was formally placed on the Index in December. "I never knew why the Holy Congregation delayed seven months before conferring on the whole world the favour of mortal sin, with which my readers in the diocese of Rome had been gratified immediately." (p. 215.)

The rest of the story may be briefly told. Houtin was one of the few who refused to retract anything; who was willing to be convinced, but could neither be cajoled nor intimidated. He quotes from a letter of George Tyrrell to Père Hyacinthe. "I have slowly come to learn by experience that courage is the rarest of all virtues and that it has almost innumerable counterfeits. . . . Taken as a whole, Modernists are cowards; but so are all men taken in a mass. . . . I fear that the courage of isolated individuals is not very efficacious unless it is supported by widely-spread public sympathy." (p. 249.)

Houtin had courage, because he was ready to face the worst his enemies could do, and because he saw that the best way to victory is Nelson's way; to go straight for the most formidable of the enemy. Bishops learned this by experience, and so did men like Mgr. Baudrillart, head of that *Institut Catholique* which proclaims itself as a rival to the University of Paris. When the coadjutor-bishop of Cambrai, in 1907, curried favour with Pius X. by preaching political sedition in France, Houtin denounced a rebellious speech of his in *Le Siècle.* The Bishop denied the facts, and threatened a prosecution for libel. Houtin held good; for he had two unexceptionable witnesses, one of them a Monsignore. The Bishop silently retreated. (p. 244.) But work of this kind, however valuable, is apt to become monotonous in itself, and still more monotonous in narration.

He found himself more and more alone, outwardly at least; for Pius X. had gradually succeeded in breaking Modernism as a public movement, and had driven the Modernists underground.[2] Houtin, for his part, drifted slowly away not only from Catholicism, but from Christianity. No Bishop had demanded that he should quit his cassock; but he put it away of his own accord in April, 1912.

Next year he obtained a Government post which gave him a bare subsistence; this, however, began to fail during the war. In 1916 he was obliged, for the second time, to sell his books and to burn those of his papers for which he had no longer room.[3] With the Peace, his position became rather more assured; and, though his health was never good, his office work and his writings now gave him all the simple comforts he cared for. For he still wrote indefatigably, by compelling instinct, and he still collected documents in proof of all that he published or intended to publish. The last chapters of his autobiography, *Ma Vie Laïque,* were published posthumously and have not been translated. Other writings, we are told, still exist in MS., and especially many of the famous green-paper bundles containing his documentary vouchers for assertions which otherwise might have been disputed. It is true that he fell into excesses in one direction which were natural to a man who had been so cruelly deceived in another. He writes, on p. 82 of *Ma Vie Laïque:* "Reader, I repeat this advice: Be *incredulous,* do not be duped." But we may meet this with what a far greater historian, Lord Acton, has quoted from Fénelon: "The most incredulous folk are nearly always duped, and grossly duped." No man is so strongly drawn in that direction as an ex-Roman Catholic; his horror of future deceptions is a measure of what he has gone through already. But Houtin steadily refused the patronage of men who would have paid him well if he had consented to write or preach mere anticlericalism; he had no more respect for the extremists of that party than for the other. Again, he points out truly that he did not write for money; that, if he had wanted money, he could have sold his manuscripts for more than he got for the printed books. In other words, there were men who would have paid his silence at a higher price than the public paid for his words.

---

[2] The story is told episodically in Mr. Fawkes' *Studies in Modernism;* systematically and chronologically in Houtin's *Hist. du Modernisme Catholique.*

[3] The first sale and holocaust had been in 1906; he describes the painful sacrifice on p. 25 of *Ma Vie Laïque.*

CHAPTER IV.

DUCHESNE, LOISY AND TYRRELL.

SIDE by side with Houtin's career, we may trace those of L. Duchesne, A. Loisy and George Tyrrell; here, we shall find the analogies and the variations equally instructive. Houtin, with all his ability, industry and honesty, would perhaps never have been in the very first rank; with him, the analytical preponderated over the constructive faculty. But Duchesne and Loisy, by the confession even of those who may least agree with their conclusions, have been in the very forefront of French, and even European, scholarship; they have combined great mastery of their sources with breadth of outlook and very exceptional powers of exposition. There was a time when Romanism was proud to possess such men, and their very existence was paraded as a reproach to the inferior scholarship of non-Romanism. A full catena of allusions to them in orthodox publications would be of extraordinary interest, but it might take years to compile; let us content ourselves in this chapter with a few gleaned here and there, in chronological order.

The following article appeared in *The Catholic Times* of Nov. 30th, 1900:—

CONTINENTAL NEWS.

[FROM OUR PARIS CORRESPONDENT.]

The Affair of the Abbe Loisy.

> PROTESTANT and anti-clerical papers have taken advantage of the affair concerning the Abbé Loisy to renew the oft-repeated and as oft-refuted charge that the teachings of the Church are incompatible with the progress of modern science. To judge how far the accusation is true we have only to look within the

Church at the present time and see among its lights such men as Mgr. Mignot, Archbishop of Albi; M. de Lapparent, Baron von Hügel, Baron von Hepling, the Abbé Duchesne and others. Those who thus accuse the Church in connection with M. Loisy go further and say that this priest is already in the arms of Protestantism. Nothing could be wider of the mark. By those who know, M. Loisy's Catholicism is considered to be on as solid ground as ever. He celebrates the Holy Sacrifice daily at his private residence at Bellevue in the environs of Paris and has the reputation of being a priest of great personal piety. The facts of his case are these. Being as he is a master in the

Science of Christian Apology

and an exegetist of the very first order, has he when face to face with the latest results of the study of "Orientalism" drawn conclusions and formulated theories at too startling variance with the generally accepted tenets of tradition in the matter of Biblical science? This is a question which only the most competent can decide. Certain it is that the Archbishop of Paris has thought fit to forbid the publication in the "Revue du Clergé Français" of the second part of M. Loisy's article, "La Religion d'Israel," the first part of which had appeared in the preceding number of that review. Be it just hinted here, by the way, that had this article, "The Religion of Israel," appeared for the first time in an English or American review it is possible that the facts there dealt with would have passed

Not Unnoticed But Unmolested.

There are priests in France who still preach from the pulpit that the world was created four thousand years before Christ. The catechism for the diocese of Paris distinctly asserts it. M. Loisy has made neither protest nor reply to this act of the Archbishop of Paris. The other day a representative of the "Temps" interviewed M. Thureau-Dangin on the subject. This gentleman, member of the French Academy and a staunch Catholic besides, is, as may be remembered, author of a recent work of mark on Catholic revival in England in the 19th century. He was able to put the question before him in a nutshell. He said among other things:—"The Abbé Loisy, notwithstanding his daring in the domain of science, has never been shaken in his faith as a Catholic, nor has he ever put the distance of a hair's breadth between himself and his Church. It is true

> that certain of his conclusions in the matter of Biblical science would not be accepted by the Archbishop of Paris; but this means nothing more than divergencies of opinion as to scientific theories." The present blast will pass and leave the Abbé Loisy, let us hope, where he was, that is, in the van of the Church's most learned apologists. In the meantime, he has been appointed professor at the "Ecole Pratique des Hautes-Etudes" at the Sorbonne. He is a man of about forty years of age, pale and of priestly aspect, and appears as one over-weighted with thought. The present writer often sees him in his daily walks. Were the Abbé Loisy ever to leave us, his loss to the Church would, it is considered, be more than that of a dozen Hyacinth Loysons.
>
> [*sic*. G.G.C.]

Duchesne, son of Breton fisher-folk, had begun as a strong ultramontane; he collected signatures among the clergy for an address beseeching the Pope to proclaim Infallibility, in the teeth of his bishop, who was a strong Gallican. His studies in Paris and at the Ecole de Rome for his doctorate, and the scientific missions to the East in which he took part, led to a considerable change of views. In 1878, his teaching was already disquieting the Ultramontane party. In 1885, "the Rector of the Institut Catholique, to save him from a storm, found no better method than to suspend his lectures and persuade the coadjutor of the Bishop of Paris to give him leave of absence, nominally for the sake of his private studies. When once the storm had blown over, the master came back to his lectures and was little disturbed again; he had become an authority."[1] One of his most brilliant pupils was Alfred Loisy, who was appointed Professor of Hebrew at the Institut Catholique in 1883. The two Professors thought and taught in agreement until 1888; and, meanwhile, they had been joined by Marcel Hébert, a priest who taught philosophy at the Ecole Fénelon, and who earned the serious disapproval of the Archbishop of Paris by printing, in a review, "Kant has had the glory of giving a powerful impulse to philosophic minds." In 1882, Hébert began to lose

[1] *Mod. Cath.*, pp. 2 ff.

his faith in Christianity; from 1891 onwards, this vanished more and more; in 1902, in consequence of a condemnation by the Archbishop of Paris, he finally broke with the Church and adopted lay dress.

In *The Contemporary Review* for March, 1903, there was a long article on Loisy by the Liberal Romanist who signed himself "Voces Catholicae." His latest book *(L'Evangile et l'Eglise),* the author maintained, "marks an epoch in Catholic thought from which coming historians will date the recovery by the Church of her universal, her catholic character, or else her lapse into the state of a *religio paganorum,* into which one-sided theologians have long been violently thrusting her." In 1905, a pious and earnest layman, Dr. Rifaux, in his *Agonie du Catholicisme,* devoted a chapter to the question "can one intellectually still remain a Catholic?" and answered, with direct reference to Loisy's work, in the affirmative (pp. 229—30). In 1906, Houtin noted how favourable had been the general reception of *L'Evangile et l'Eglise.* "In England, the Jesuit review, *The Month,* published a benevolent article by Fr. Lucas; in *The Tablet,* M. Loisy was defended by Dom Butler and Fr. W. H. Kent and by Mr. Wilfrid Ward; in *The Pilot,* by Dr. Barry. The Anglican reviews also showed themselves very favourable *(Church Times, Guardian, Contemporary, Edinburgh* and *Quarterly Reviews, Literary Guide. . .)* M. Loisy was attacked by few except by the *Inquirer,* in an article by W. Addis, a Roman Catholic priest who had become an Anglican. In Italy, Abbé Minocchi defended the book against M. Gayraud in the *Rassegna Nazionale.* The *Studi Religiosi* and the *Nuova Parola* were favourable." So much for 1906. Next year, Rifaux published a sequel to his *Agonie;* he called it *Les Conditions du Retour au Catholicisme,* and printed contributions from thirty well known believers, nine of whom were priests, three nobles, and two doctors. In this book, Duchesne and Loisy are frequently cited in proof that intellectual distinction and intellectual freedom are compatible with true Romanism. (pp. 60, 61, 63, 69, 97, 326.) "Duchesne's *Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise* is unanimously admired and accepted. . . . Such an example shows us what is the future [success] reserved for the theses of M. Loisy." But, in fact, the tide was now turning very clearly. Duchesne had been made a Monsignore, and "under this title he is beginning a new career. He no longer writes much, and he chooses subjects which Roman prudence does not fear; but he is forming good pupils who will pick up his work again."[2] St. George Mivart, of whom Romanists had boasted as one who could reconcile great scientific distinction with their own faith, had died in excommunication, "after his articles in the *Nineteenth Century* and *Fortnightly* of January, 1900, on his refusing to sign a formula of faith presented to him by Cardinal Vaughan."[3] And, in February, 1906, George Tyrrell, the ablest and not the least learned among the English Jesuits, had left the society; to him we must presently return in detail.

For a definite campaign had begun against the new school even before the death of Leo XIII. (1903). With Pius X., a conspicuously honest and religious man, but unlearned and narrow-minded, the pitched battles began.[4] In 1906, books by three of the most distinguished Romanist writers were put on the Index —Paul Viollet, Fr. Laberthonnière and Fogazzaro, though the first had published under the *imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Besançon. A few weeks later, a Papal Encyclical insisted upon the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The Liberals had founded two magazines; in Italy, the *Rinnovamento,* in France, *Demain;* the former was condemned in April, 1906, but promised amendment. In July, 1907, the Pope published his Encyclical *Lamentabili,* solemnly condemning sixty-five propositions *en bloc,* without specifying their respective perversities, or naming their authors, or even citing them verbally and correctly. Of these, thirty-eight were evidently intended for Loisy, but one or two seemed intended for the Archbishop of Albi, and another, no doubt unintentionally, fell upon Newman. In the face of these condemnations, *Demain* felt compelled to suspend further publication. Von Hügel, with Fogazzaro and eight other distinguished Italian thinkers, held a conference in the Italian Tyrol to concert some plan of action; but nothing came of it. Then (16th Sept., 1907), Pius X. published the still more militant Encyclical *Pascendi.* He there attributed all the defects of modern faith to curiosity, pride and ignorance of scholastic philosophy; he proposed seven remedies for these evils. (1) Scholastic philosophy must be made the very foundation of sacred science. (2) All persons tainted with Modernism must be excluded from teaching in Catholic seminaries or universities. (3) Books and periodicals of that nature must be kept from all pupils; bishops must banish them, even if they bear the *imprimatur* of another diocese. (4) Bishops must enforce the censorship system far more strictly upon all publications. (5) "Henceforward, let Bishops no longer permit, or permit very rarely, Conferences of their priests"; and, even then, under very definite restrictions. (6) To ensure execution of these measures, a "Vigilance Council" is at once to be formed in every diocese, to meet every two months under the Bishop's presidency, and to deliberate and decide in secret. (7) Lest all this fall into desuetude, the Bishops and Superiors of Religious Orders must render account to the Holy See one year hence, upon oath, of the manner in which they have executed these commands; the account and the oath to be thenceforward repeated every three years. Tyrrell's attitude towards *Pascendi* will be dealt with later. In France, it was discussed by Fonsegrive, a Liberal Catholic and teacher of philosophy in a Paris Lycée. He pointed out that it condemned, almost by name, the editor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* Ferdinand Brunetière, whose conversion to Catholicism in the height of his literary fame had been advertised as one of the greatest of present-day victories. And he summed up: "The gesture which Pius X. has just made means the rupture of diplomatic relations between the Church and the world." Another religious journalist, Julien de Narfon, reported: "A bishop, whose letter is under my eyes, confessed to me a few weeks ago: 'I owe a grudge against my parents for ever teaching me to read and write. The ideal, my dear sir—I mean, the present-day ideal—consists in ceasing to think, to talk, and, above all, to write!'" The Modernists drew up a formal *Programme* in protest, and organised for definite resistance in case of need. Pius at once condemned the book, and laid excommunication on all who had in any way contributed to it, reserving absolution to himself alone. "Perhaps he flattered himself, in decreeing this, that the authors would no longer dare to celebrate Mass, and would thus be discovered. But no single Roman priest changed his ordinary liturgical habits; and it seemed as if the authors formed a society as resolute as it was perfectly organised." But no Roman priest can resist a determined Pope; and orthodox journalists are able to boast nowadays that Modernism is completely vanquished. In fact, it is driven underground exactly as the *De Haeretico Comburendo* drove the Lollards into hiding. No conspicuous figure can openly profess Modernism; no regular Modernist organisation is possible; everybody is willing to abjure it when accused; but the general temperature of faith in strict Roman dogma is far lower in this present generation than in the last.[5]

---

[2] *Mod. Cath.,* p. 24.

[3] Petre, Vol. II., p. 147.

[4] Full story in *Mod. Cath.,* Chapter X.

Pius X. was a man who would have gone to the stake for morality and religion as he conceived them. He was the autocratic ruler of an enormously powerful

[5] See Appendix.

organisation; and he had no difficulty in pulverising the few opponents who were as convinced and as courageous as himself. In October, Tyrrell was "deprived of the right of participating in the Holy Sacraments." In November, the Pope excommunicated all who should speak or write against *Lamentabili* or *Pascendi,* and in December the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan excommunicated all who should contribute in any way to the *Rinnovamento.* The students of the Catholic Universities of France were forbidden to attend, without express episcopal permission in each case, lectures at the State Universities on such dangerous subjects as history or philosophy; such permissions were to be rarely given. Attempts were made to eject four too liberal professors from the Institut Catholique of Paris. Tyrrell attempted to raise an international fund for the maintenance of priests against whom the Bishops were acting; but he was dissuaded. Loisy, who refused all submission, was excommunicated by name as one "whom every man ought to avoid." (March, 1908.)

In Germany, the friction, though considerable, was rather less; it is fully described in Pernot's *Politique de Pie X.,* Chapters II., III., V., VI., VIII. and XIV. In Italy, in Austria, and in America, there were grave incidents which may be read at the end of the fifteenth chapter of Houtin's *Modernisme Catholique.* Nine months after the publication of *Pascendi,* the Pope was able to strike a medal in which he was represented, Encyclical in hand, crushing a foul monster, with the legend, "Condemnation of the Error of Modernism." "This little work of art was saluted with a few cheap jests; but it expressed an undeniable reality, the triumph of the Papacy in the eyes of the whole world." In 1910, he won another Pyrrhic victory; he imposed upon all Romanist curés and candidates for the priesthood, and upon all teachers in seminaries, university colleges and universities, an anti-Modernist oath running to nearly three pages of print.[6] Here are specimens: "I reject absolutely the heretical invention of the evolution of dogmas. . . . . I submit also, with all proper reverence, and I adhere with my whole mind to all the condemnations, declarations and prescriptions which are contained in the Encyclical *Pascendi* and in the Decree *Lamentabili*, especially in the matter of what is called the History of Dogma. Again, I repudiate the error of those who affirm that the faith proposed by the Church can conflict with history, and that Catholic dogmas, in the sense wherein they are now understood, cannot be brought into agreement with the more authentic origins of the Christian Religion. . . . Furthermore, I reject the opinion of those who hold that the teacher of history or theology, or the writer on those subjects, should first put away his preconceived opinions either concerning the supernatural origin of Catholic tradition or of assistance divinely promised for the perpetual conservation of each revealed truth; and, then, that the writings of all the Fathers should be interpreted by the principles of science alone, setting all sacred authority aside, and using the same freedom of judgment wherewith all profane documents are wont to be investigated. . . . All these things I promise to keep faithfully, entirely and sincerely, and to guard inviolably, never turning aside therefrom, either in teaching or in any other way by speech or writing. Thus I promise, thus I swear, so help me God and the Holy Gospels."

The obedient journals represented this, falsely enough, as amounting to no more than the decisions of the Trent and Vatican Councils which every priest had had to learn and accept in his seminary days. The matter might have gone off with comparatively little friction, if the hierarchy had not attempted to force the oath upon a woman. Miss M. D. Petre belongs to one of the oldest and most honourable of Roman Catholic families; to some of the time-servers who have blamed her, she might have replied, *mutatis mutandis,* very much as Bishop Ullathorne replied to Manning: " My dear sir, allow me to say that I taught the Catechism with the mitre on my 'ed when you were a 'eretic."[7] She was Tyrrell's literary executrix, and was preparing his autobiography and life for the press; the hierarchy wished to control her; and she was called upon by her bishop to subscribe to the condemnations contained in *Lamentabili* and *Pascendi.* She asked why, as a laywoman, this should be required of her; she, like many others, had read those two documents with pain, since they seemed to condemn such writers as Newman and Tyrrell and to hamper the mind's natural freedom in face of historical and scientific facts. The Bishop vouchsafed no answer, but renewed his demand some time later. She answered in a letter which she afterwards published in *The Times* (Nov. 2nd, 1910). She refused to sign any declaration in the unreal sense in which many others were swearing, and asked point blank whether the Bishop could assure her that all the condemnations or propositions of those two papal decrees were *de fide,* and would always remain *de fide* in the same sense. " The Bishop of Southwark did not answer Miss Petre; but, unwilling to excommunicate publicly a lady who bears one of the greatest names in English Roman Catholicism, he secretly gave orders to his priests to refuse her the sacraments in his diocese."

---

[6] For the whole story, with translation of the oath, see *Mod. Cath.*, Chapter XX. The original of the oath is in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for Sept. 9th, 1910 (Vol. II., pp. 669ff.).

The mass of clergy were more pliable than the lady, being indeed far more at the Pope's mercy. Some protested that they were swearing merely as a matter of form. In Germany, where even Roman Catholic Universities have some tradition of free learning and free teaching, there were serious protests; and Pius was obliged to dispense a few professors from the oath, while branding them as cowards who " remain miserably enslaved to the judgments of men, and weakly fearing the authority of those who cry and shout—not sincerely, but in hatred of the Catholic profession—that this oath wrongs the dignity of human reason and hampers the progress of learning." At the end of the term prescribed by the Pope, there were only some forty clergy of the whole Church who had flatly refused. But " in the summer of 1911, three Italian Franciscans, from the same convent in Liguria, in which all the friars had sworn the oath, embarked at Genoa in lay dress to go and start lay life in South America." It needed the courage of a backwoodsman to take a step like that. To the ordinary Roman priest, son of a peasant and transplanted from his native fields to the hothouse atmosphere of the seminary, such a step is manifestly impossible. They are used to simple bachelor life; but no man is inured to absolute starvation; moreover, many even of the most determined Modernists were deeply and sincerely attached to the sacraments of their Church. Tyrrell may, therefore, have been perfectly right when he estimated at 40,000 the number of Romanist priests who could not accept, with perfect honesty, all the condemnations and propositions of *Lamentabili* and *Pascendi*.

---

[7] Dom Cuthbert Butler, *Life of Bp. Ullathorne,* Vol. II., p. 152. As Dom Butler notes: the lack of the aspirate " no doubt was a relic of the Yorkshire dialect of his childhood, and was probably unconscious."

Early in 1911, the liberal clergy of France had a momentary triumph; Duchesne was elected to the French Academy in opposition to Mgr. Baudrillart, Rector of the Institut Catholique. For, though Duchesne had always avoided identifying himself with Modernism, he had been the father in France of all enlightened teaching in ecclesiastical history. He possessed to perfection the art of leaving facts and conclusions to be inferred, without brutally stating them; thus his extraordinary learning and ability had moved with comparatively little official opposition.

True, his historical lectures at the Institut Catholique, lithographed for students' use, had aroused certain misgivings, and had been forbidden in some seminaries. "One day, when a scholar asked him to print them, he answered, 'Do you know of any Insurance Company against the Index?' . . . . However, by careful search and after long and dangerous experiments, he managed to compose a *Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise* which obtained the *imprimatur* of the Master of the Holy Palace; that is, a passport from the papal censorship."[8] The Jesuit review, *Études,* extolled him as "a glory which casts its rays over the French Church, and which that Church will always claim for her own." Pius X. himself approved of the book, implying that he had looked into it. The third volume had appeared just before the Academy election; and the faithful Catholic who was chosen to deliver the usual public welcome to the new member addressed him thus: "The masters of unbelieving science have gradually ceased to contest the fact that Catholicism is the uninterrupted and certain consequence of the work which Christ entrusted to His Apostles. This solid occupation of history by the Church is your victory and that of your school." The University of Louvain had given him a doctorate *honoris causa.*

Yet, in September, the Italian translation of his *History* was forbidden in all Italian seminaries, "even for simple purposes of reference," as "eminently dangerous, and even fatal" to Catholic students. Duchesne ate humble pie; he was ready to alter his text in order to avoid censure. But this was of no avail; a decree of the Index condemned the book, in all its editions (Jan. 22nd, 1912). The public talked: "they weighed against each other the authority of the Master of the Palace and that of the Index; i.e. the two documents by which Pius, after approving the work, now signed its prohibition. The pontifical press then hastened to declare, 'from a trustworthy source,'

[8] *Mod. Cath.,* p. 349.

that the Pope himself had been able to read Mgr. Duchesne's work 'only during the forced repose imposed upon him by an illness,' and that he had been 'deeply shocked' at it."[9]

Loisy, meanwhile, was Professor at the Collège de France, but excommunicate. He is now "a dissenter from all creeds."

Tyrrell, in one most important respect, differs from any of these other three: he was not a born Roman Catholic, but a convert. I need not dwell upon his case here, since it may so easily be studied in an admirable biography and an equally admirable article.[10] This Irish boy, of good family and remarkable intellectual endowments, was converted in 1879 at the age of 18, and joined the Jesuits. Like Houtin, he was gradually disillusioned by the conflicts between truth, as it appeared to him after long study and patient thought, and the things which his fellows expected him to believe if possible, but in any case to preach to the world. As with Houtin again, it was Newman who seemed at one time to make it possible for this Jesuit to reconcile orthodoxy with history and common sense, but whose method finally brought him into hopeless conflict with orthodoxy. There is a remarkable likeness between the trials which distressed Newman for many years among the Romanists with whom he had thrown in his lot, and those recorded by Tyrrell. Reading W. Ward's *Life of Newman* after Tyrrell's *Autobiography,* we may ask ourselves seriously whether, if the great Cardinal had gone over at the same age, as fresh to life and with the same physical vigour, he also would not have pronounced the Everlasting No, and refused to make further terms with a system which he now saw on all its sides.

---

[9] *Mod. Cath.,* p. 360.

[10] *Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell,* by M. D. Petre (Arnold, 1912). Fawkes, *Studies in Modernism,* Chapter I.

Certainly it was Newman's influence which did most to inspire Tyrrell's Modernism; next to that, it was Loisy's. With Houtin, in later life, he entered into correspondence. When Houtin sent Tyrrell his *Crise du Clergé* (1906) the latter wrote: "I have read it all carefully; and, though it contains nothing that I ought not to have been prepared for, yet new instances always rouse one to consider one's position as a Romanist. Mendacity seems to have eaten into the very heart of the whole system."[11]

Tyrrell, then, refused to make terms with the system which he found actually at work around him, yet he refused also to justify the prognostications of his enemies by seceding: "Nothing would gratify Rome more than my overt secession to the Anglican or Old Catholic Church."[12] He died excommunicate, but insisting that he remained a Catholic, and deserving that title far more truly than those who condemned him. As Mr. Fawkes says, "Tyrrell was obsessed by the idea of Catholicism." For his own condemnation of his official judges, he had no status, no authority, no weapon but courage and honesty, no allies but that universal conscience of mankind to which he constantly appealed: *securus judicat orbis terrarum.* "Injustice and tyranny roused his indignation; his fierceness against clericalism was less intellectual than moral. With the ineffectual protest of the pietist or the politician against controversy he had little sympathy. He thought it a pose and an insincere one; errors must be contradicted and truth upheld. And, as a controversialist, he could be vehement. Those who, like Cardinal Mercier, crossed swords with him, had reason to regret their temerity; since Newman there has been no such master of the craft as he. For him, the battle of Modernism, in which he took so prominent a part, was not one of correct against incorrect opinion, but of right against wrong, of the truth

[11] Petre, Vol. II., p. 293.
[12] *Ibid.,* Vol. II., p. 383.

against a lie. And he fought not for his own hand, but for the larger interests compromised by that 'all-permeating mendacity which is the most alarming feature of the present ecclesiastical crisis. . . . Those Modernists who put their trust in the spread of truth will labour in vain unless they first labour for the spread of truthfulness. . . . What would it avail to sweep the accumulated dust and cobwebs of centuries out of the house of God; to purge our liturgy of fables and legends; to make a bonfire of our falsified histories, our forged decretals, our spurious relics; to clear off the mountainous debts to truth and candour incurred by our ancestors in the supposed interests of edification—what would it avail to exterminate those swarming legions of lies, if we still keep the spirit that breeds them? . . The only infallible guardian of truth is the spirit of truthfulness. Not till the world learns to look to Rome as the home of truthfulness and straight dealing will it ever learn to look to her as the citadel of truth.' "[13] And again, to the Old Catholic Bishop Herzog: "Sooner or later the historical lie of the Papacy must be recognised by every educated Romanist; and in that day the whole Church will be Old Catholic."[14] Such was the end of the ablest English-speaking Jesuit of modern times; the man to whom, in earlier days, Cardinal Vaughan had been accustomed to send those hesitating converts or wavering believers whose capture or retention was most desired by the Roman Church! Those who wish to pursue this subject further should read, if they have time for nothing else, that letter of forty pages to the General of the Jesuits, in which Tyrrell explained why he was shaking the dust of the Order from his feet. It ends with the Psalmist's words: "Our soul is escaped even as a bird out of the snare of the fowler: the snare is broken, and we are delivered." (Vol. II., pp. 458 ff.)

[13] Fawkes, p. 12.

[14] Petre, Vol. II., p. 383.

CHAPTER V.

A CATHOLIC SCIENTIST.

THE biologist, St. George Mivart, was born in 1827, educated at Clapham and Harrow, and went over to Rome in 1844. "His change of faith is said to have been prompted by a taste for Gothic Architecture, and finally determined by a study of Milner's *End of Religious Controversy.*" (Incidentally, the Roman Catholicism of the last four centuries has done less for Gothic Architecture than non-Romanism,[1] and poor Pugin, whose love for Gothic took him over to the Roman Church, did not conceal his disappointment there;[2] also, Milner's book is full of false quotations from the Fathers, which were current in his own Church and his own day, but which no educated Roman Catholic would dare to defend in the present generation.) Mivart became F.R.S. in 1869; in 1879 he was President of the British Association; the Pope gave him a Doctorate, and so did the University of Louvain. His monograph on *The Cat* "for fulness and accuracy of detail and lucidity of exposition is worthy to rank with Huxley's crayfish." For a long time, men boasted of his name in proof that Rome could actually produce and cherish great scientists, together with the names of the Jesuit geologist, Alphonse Renard (who in fact ended as a married man,) and Antonio Stoppani (who did retain his priestly status till his death).[3]

But Mivart, in later life, found it more and more impossible to live in those ultramontanist chambers in which the authorities were gradually blocking up even such windows and air-holes as he had found in the Church when he first joined it. At last, therefore, he deliberately challenged the hierarchy on what had become, with him, a question of life and death; Is Catholicism to be taken as essentially synonymous with obscurantism and ignorance?[4] He therefore wrote certain articles in well known Reviews, especially in contradiction of the lurid ideas of Hell which his Church too often encouraged still, and of her contention that she, unlike other Christian bodies, never varied in important beliefs. In his own words: "My object in writing my articles was threefold. There have long been, as everybody is aware, two sections in the Catholic Church; one commonly known as *ultramontane,* the other frequently distinguished as *liberal,* though I have objected to the latter designation, saying that its members should simply claim to be Catholics pure and simple, unless it be 'Catholics *par excellence.*'" (*N.C.*, p. 425.) . . . "My purpose was to test this question decisively, should it be possible for me to do so. I therefore wrote in such a way as, should I escape condemnation, might afford some really good ground for the hope that a progressive as distinguished from a petrified Catholicism might be able to live and flourish. My action was strongly opposed by some of my liberal Catholic friends who feared that I might bring down on myself the thunders of the Vatican, and so make our common position an impossible one. But I argued that the time had come when we ought to know whether our position was, or was not, an honest and secure one; that it was useless to go on living in a 'fool's paradise,' and that for my part I was utterly sick of verbal jugglings which could only bring discredit on a faith for which they were offered as apologies. I was determined to rest satisfied with ambiguous teaching no longer, but to find out whether it was possible for me and my friends to remain in the Roman Communion, or whether we must leave, or be expelled from the Catholic Church. I therefore carried out my design and wrote my two articles with a result which is now patent to all men." (*N.C.*, p. 426.)

---

[1] I have pointed this out on pp. 476 ff and 593 ff of *Art and the Reformation,* and have since received hearty expressions of agreement on this point from two Roman Catholics.

[2] *Dict. Nat. Biog. Suppt.* III. 179 (article by the Roman Catholic, J. M. Rigg, from which my next quotation also is taken).

[3] *Mod. Cath.,* p. 107.

---

[4] All the essentials of this story may be found in two volumes—*Fortnightly Review,* N.S. Vol. LXVII. (1900), and *Nineteenth Century and After,* Vol. XLVII. (1900). I shall refer to these as *F.R.* and *N.C.* respectively.

His first essay of the kind, on *The Catholic Church and Biblical Criticism*, was " a very bold article, wherein I built largely on views which had been put forward by Cardinal Newman." It was not condemned; and " I became more and more persuaded that science and the Roman Catholic Church were in no way irreconcilable. I continued happy in the position I had taken up till all of a sudden, in 1893, appeared Pope Leo's Encyclical, known as *Providentissimus Deus*." (*N.C.*, p. 430.) However, an intimate friend, " the most learned theologian I knew," gave him morphia for a while. Then he became still more uneasy, and determined to test his position more definitely by more challenging articles. The first of these were two on *Happiness in Hell.* He saw thinking and right-minded Catholics seriously scandalised by the doctrines once enforced and still permitted on this subject, and, therefore, he did his best to show that " they readily admitted of so complete a transformation that they no longer need distress men of ordinary good feeling." These articles were at once placed upon the Index, and Mivart submitted. But, in August, 1899, he " wrote to Cardinal Steinhuber, S.J., (Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Index), to say that since my article had been freshly placed on the Index (in a new edition of that publication), if I did not receive answers to certain questions I should feel compelled to withdraw my submission. The reply I received did not answer those questions, and my submission is withdrawn accordingly." (*F.R.*, p. 26.)

In consequence of these articles, " I was called upon by Cardinal Vaughan, in fulfilment, as he thought, of his duty as Archbishop, to sign a declaration of faith wherein was contained a declaration about Scripture which it was utterly impossible for me to subscribe." He put a plain question to the Archbishop, What did these words really mean? and received no answer to it. "This finally convinced me that an impassable gulf yawns between science and Roman Catholic teaching, as also that it is absolutely impossible for a reasonably well educated man to join the Roman Catholic Church if he understands what her teaching about Scripture really is, and what the doctrines are which he must accept." (*N.C.*, p. 431.) For, if we are to take in their plain sense the declarations about Scripture contained in those decrees of the Councils of Florence, Trent and Vatican which the Cardinal pressed upon Mivart, we fall into the grossest absurdities. "The reader must not forget that no distinction is drawn between any of these books [of the Bible, including the 'Apocrypha'] by the Councils above referred to. All of them, with all their parts, are alike declared 'sacred and canonical.' The tale relating how Tobit, aided by the Archangel Raphael, by means of a fish's liver, put to flight a homicidal demon, subsequently confined by the Archangel in Egypt, and the other marvel about the husbandman Habbaccuc, of Judea, who, when carrying a bowl of pottage to his labourers, was seized by an angel, by the hair of his head, and carried away to Daniel, placed a second time in the lion's den, to supply the prophet with a dinner, are in no way declared to be less true or sacred than the books of the law or the more solemn exhortations of the prophets. . . . Can it be denied then by anyone who knows how binding on Roman Catholics are all decrees of General Councils, confirmed by the Holy See, that such persons are bound, under anathema, to accept as infallibly true, in the sense in which it professes to be true, every narrative and every assertion any 'sacred' writer has made in any part of any one of the books distinguished by the

Roman Catholic Church as being 'sacred and canonical'?" (*N.C.*, p. 433.) . . . "It is an indisputable fact that no Roman Catholic acquainted with the above Papal declaration and the Vatican conciliar decree can explain away any biblical narrative or historical statement without being guilty, materially at least if not formally, of heresy. That this bondage has not been felt more irksome by Catholics than it has in fact been felt to be, is due in part to their general ignorance with respect to the Old Testament, in part to their not being acquainted with these conciliar decrees and all they involve, and finally to the way in which many of the clergy play fast and loose with these obligations, and are unwilling they should be generally known and their force correctly appreciated." (*N.C.*, p. 435.)

Mivart was specially, and justly, indignant at the attempts to justify the Church's treatment of Galileo; it seemed to him that the apologists of his day betrayed themselves, by the principles on which they stood, as potential persecutors, who lacked not the old spirit but only the old power and opportunities. Among those apologists was one of the most distinguished and candid men in his Church, Wilfrid Ward. Mivart writes "[Mr. Ward] has not scrupled to affirm that 'Galileo was condemned for applying his theory to the detailed interpretation of Scripture, which he ought to have left to the theologian. It was for this intrusion on the theological domain that his position was condemned, although Copernicanism had already been tolerated as a scientific hypothesis.' The repetition of this abominable falsehood, which has been again and again refuted, may be partly due to what yet another Catholic Apologist—Mr. Wegg-Prosser—has written on the subject. The last-named author makes a similar statement, though he can bring no evidence to support it. He tells us, indeed, of the Cardinals [Bellarmine] and del Monte having had a conversation, in March, 1615, wherein they agreed that Galileo 'ought to avoid entering on the interpretation of Scripture,' but he introduces this statement by the words, 'It is said,' while he himself remarks upon the unsatisfactory evidential nature of conversations merely reported, and not at once written down. The only other passage referring to Scripture interpretation is a statement by Father Riccardi to the Inquisitor of Florence that Galileo must put forward his heliocentric view merely as an hypothesis, 'and this without alluding to the interpretation of Scripture.' Now Galileo's writings found their place on the Index, along with other works favouring Copernicanism, in the year 1616. Then it was that Sacred Congregation made a solemn decree about *that false and Pythagorean doctrine, altogether opposed to Divine Scripture on the mobility of the earth and the immobility of the sun.* But there is much more than this to show what was the true reason and motive of the condemnation of Copernicanism. Galileo was condemned in 1633, not for applying his theory to the interpretation of Scripture, but because, after Copernicanism had been condemned, and in defiance of an order from the Pope and the Holy Office, that he was not to hold, defend, or teach the theory in any manner, he had published his *Dialogue,* a scientific treatise in which he represented Copernicanism as a probably true theory. . . . . . The condemnation of Galileo by the Inquisition was consequent on eight heads of accusation which had been drawn up against him in 1632. Now there is not one of them which refers, in the very faintest way, to Scripture interpretation. As to *that* it was not Galileo, but his judges, who went wrong, and they did so doubly. Ecclesiastical authority gave judgment as to physical science and so went *ultra vires.* But it did much more than that. It founded its erroneous decree affecting physical science, which was *not* its own province, upon an erroneous judgment about the meaning of Scripture, which, up till that time, had been universally supposed *to be* its own province. These proceedings demonstrate two facts which are most important to Catholic men of science. One is that what is declared by even the highest known Congregation (that of the *Holy Office*) whose President is the Pope, and when the subject matter treated of is Scripture, may be quite erroneous. The other noteworthy fact is that men of physical science may have truer religious perceptions imparted to them, than any Roman Congregation. This the Galileo case demonstrated absolutely and once for all, since we may safely affirm that whatever has shown itself to be a *fact,* is *at least a possibility.*" (*F.R.,* pp. 32—33.)

Nor was Mivart's indignation merely historical; it was increased by the treatment which he saw actually meted out to other scientists, his contemporaries. "Poor Father Leroy, the Dominican, was summoned to Rome, and forced, willy-nilly, to recant and condemn what he had taught; and Father Zahm, the author of an edifying work, *Evolution and Dogma,* has been induced, by a promise quickly broken, to recall it from circulation. The 'doctrine of Evolution' was indeed very near being authoritatively condemned by the Curialists, but, much as they wished, they did not dare to condemn it. One hardly knows whether to be more diverted by the impudent folly of such proceedings or moved to indignation by their immorality. Happily, the Curialists are, to quote the words of an Italian Doctor of Divinity who knows them well, 'as impotent as they are unscrupulous and corrupt.'" (*N.C.,* p. 62.)

This leads Mivart to write: "What, in my opinion, is the great peril which Catholicity now runs is occasioned by the deep and appalling disregard for, if not sometimes positive aversion to, scientific truth, which is exhibited by Catholic advocates and—high above all—by the Roman Curia; whereof some of the most recent manifestations would seem to imply that, if only power can thereby be retained, any amount of deception and of terrorism over weak credulous minds and tenderly scrupulous consciences is abundantly justified." (*F.R.*, p. 38.) And again: "What a contrast is offered by the quibbling verbal jugglery and shuffling of these apologetic theologians to the proceedings of men of science and of historical experts in their search after truth! The conception *truth* does not seem even to enter into the minds of these apologists, but only ideas as to what may be expedient, what may satisfy temporarily, and so serve their turn for the present." (*N.C.*, p. 435.) Again: "The Pope's declaration that the Bible can 'contain no errors' is but a matter of formal parade, only saved from falsehood by a more ingenious than honest distinction between 'errors' and 'untruths,' whereby theologians are able to declare that statements 'utterly untrue' are entirely 'free from error.'" (*N.C.*, p. 59.) Thus there is a regular system of jugglery: "Dogmas cannot be explicitly called in question, though sometimes they may be so explained that they thereby become practically explained away, or even reversed!" (*N.C.*, p. 53.) With this we may compare another Catholic's words (Robert Dell, in *N.C.*, p. 683). "The Jesuit theologians themselves set the example of non-natural interpretation. . . Père Charles Antoine, S.J., for instance, declares the pronouncement of Benedict XIV. to be infallible, and immediately goes on to explain it away."

Cardinal Vaughan's attempt to put pressure upon Mivart drove him to express his thoughts at last with perfect frankness. In March, 1900, while he was dying of diabetes, he published another article in *The Nineteenth Century*. He there wrote despairingly of the future of his Church, mainly by reason of "the fatal character of Infallibility which the Roman Catholic Church claims, but which (most fortunately for herself) the Anglican Church does not. That character of Infallibility is, as I have elsewhere said, like the fatal garment of Nessus which, till Romanism manages to shake it off, will cling to her and eat away her substance till she is reduced to a mouldering and repulsive skeleton. And yet that terrible claim, maintained for so many centuries, could hardly now be got rid of without causing otherwise fatal results. It is this pretension of Infallibility which carries with it the need of also pretending that Church dogma never has changed and never by any possibility can change, during all the ages of ages of the world's future existence." (*N.C.*, p. 439.) . . . "Until the dogma of Infallibility is acknowledged to be erroneous, or has been so satisfactorily explained away by dexterous theologians as to be no longer an incubus, Roman Catholics are saddled with, and bound to maintain, an absurdity as great as would be the attribution to the Pope of a power to dispense from, or abrogate, the law of gravitation. . . . An assembly of men, such as the Pope and the bishops of the Vatican Council, solemnly declaring that all dogma shall undergo no change or modification in meaning 'as long as the world shall last,' seems to me comparable with an assembly of ants solemnly declaring that the stability of their nest shall know no end. As to the past, Harnack shows plainly how soon modifications arose in the definitions of early Councils concerning the Trinity, the Holy Ghost, and the two natures of Christ. And in our own day we have but to look about us to see plain evidence of change." (*N.C.*, p. 441.)

Before these words appeared in print, Mivart had already been excommunicated (Jan. 18th) and he died on the 1st of April.

Mr. Rigg, in the *Dictionary of National Biography,* insinuates that Dr. Mivart erred because he did not understand Catholic Philosophy. Yet he was a member of the Metaphysical Society, with Newman and other Catholic theologians of the first rank; and his companions applauded him in those days, when (to quote Mr. Rigg) "he opposed a neo-scholastic realism to the prevalent agnosticism." It was only his further experience of the spirit which reigned in his own Church which led him to as definite a revolt against her "philosophy" as against her attitude towards science and history. True, his mind was primarily that of a biologist—too much so, it was said by those from whom he differed—but this mind, and his serious discussions on philosophy with Catholics and others, did at least enable him to expose one mockery to which those superficial journalists who are the main champions of Romanism in modern England pay daily homage, in their ignorance of the true history of thought within their own Church. Whereas these men din into the public ear that Romanism possesses the only philosophy which can be called philosophy at all, Mivart, after a lifelong experience of its weaknesses, writes: "Persons are generally under the impression that the authorities of the Roman Catholic Communion pre-eminently love what is clear and definite and like to have issues well defined. That Church is supposed to thoroughly know her own mind, to say what she means, and mean what she says, and to have the courage of her opinions. But the facts are not so. The Church will not, because she cannot, give a plain answer to a plain question of that kind. As to matters quite unpractical, the belief to be entertained by the faithful will be unequivocally declared, but not as to what men must, or must not, hold as to the animals which entered and left the ark, the history of Babel or that of Habbaccuc, etc. The parade of trustworthy authority and infallible guidance is but a solemn sham, as is the profession of tender consideration for the souls of her children. Her action is that of one who has no real belief, no real zeal for her dogmata, or care for her children crying out to her in their distress. She gives stammering equivocal replies. You must at the risk of your soul's salvation believe the decrees of the Councils, yet what they mean you may disregard. It is absolutely necessary for you to declare that the Bible contains no errors, yet you may regard a number of its narratives and assertions as widely divergent from truth." (*N.C.*, p. 438.)

The best comment on words of this kind is that of Robert Dell, a Catholic who sympathised greatly with Mivart, even though he thought him something of an extremist. He writes, concerning the philosophy popular in the present Roman Church: "Descartes is now treated almost as a heretic, and modern philosophy is denounced as false and incompatible with Christianity. In the domain of philosophy there has taken place during the last half century in the Catholic Church a thorough-going reaction, and an organised attempt has been and is being made to resuscitate a philosophical system of a bygone day and impose it on all Catholics. The result is that Catholic theologians and philosophers are out of touch with modern thought; it is not merely that they adhere to philosophical ideas which have long been abandoned by thinking men, they speak a language that is unintelligible to the modern mind. They do not grapple with modern problems in the outer world, because there is no common ground on which they can meet modern thinkers and their arguments do not touch the points now at issue. They can only deal with these questions in their class-rooms before grown-up schoolboys, or in a popular form before a 'Catholic world' which has been brought up not to know how to test for itself the value of arguments or ideas. In spite of all their pretensions to instruct the world, the world is, in fact, left by them to take care of itself; instead of attempting to 'comprehend all vagrom men' they wash their hands of modern intellect and 'presently call the rest of the watch together and thank God [they] are rid of a knave.' . . . It is a policy of despair. Their rusty and antiquated weapons have failed them, they have been driven back into their own intrenchments and as a last hope they have taken refuge from the modern artillery in an underground cavern, the atmosphere of which is becoming so stifling that they can no longer control their subordinates, who are forced to come out one by one into the open air to escape from being asphyxiated. Intelligent Catholics are more and more coming to realise the futility and uselessness of their theological schools and the inability of their apologists to defend them when they are attacked or to justify their position; left as they are to shift for themselves and to form their own synthesis as best they may, they are more and more ceasing to look to the official exponents of Catholicism for help in finding their way through the intellectual difficulties of modern times. And the reason is that the apologetics of the official exponents are based on a system of philosophy which in their hands proves itself to be effete, and their methods are unscientific and untrustworthy; effective enough to deal with the problems of the thirteenth, or maybe the sixteenth century, they are useless in dealing with the wholly different problems and conditions of the present day." (*N.C.,* pp. 674—6.)

There is much talk at present about Jacques Maritain, who is being translated into English and is extolled as having given new and convincing force to St. Thomas' philosophy. Wherever I have had time to follow him, I have found that his "philosophy" is a sort of bastard mediævalism, which conveniently ignores some of Aquinas' most important tenets.

CHAPTER VI.

INFALLIBILITY AND THE PRIESTHOOD.

LET us now consider the effect of the Infallibility doctrine upon the priests and the hierarchy. Upon those whom I call the true Catholics—whose religion is positive, based on their own mystical experience, and not just a preponderantly negative creed born of enmity to Protestantism or to Agnosticism—upon such true Catholics, its effect is doubtless very small; they accept it; they may positively welcome it; but it adds little to their real creed, and they would have been quite happy—as, in fact, some of the best Catholic generations were perfectly happy—without it.

A great many of the priests, also, are in this same category. Christianity, for them, is rather a principle of unity than of division; and, doing their own work well as it comes to their hand, they dismiss too curious enquiries about other men's faith with Christ's words "What is that to thee; follow thou Me."

But, in proportion as a priest engages in controversy, or rises to the more responsible (and, therefore, more exposed) places in the hierarchy, in that proportion the question of Infallibility presses upon him. He has to accept it more explicitly, to expound it more openly, and to be ready with arguments, if only cut-and-dried arguments, in defence of it. Of these officers it must be said more strictly, as we can say only loosely of the rank and file, that for them there is no "question" of Infallibility; that the mind which questions it is already heretical. This has been said repeatedly in public, with exemplary clearness, by one of our most prominent Jesuit controversialists of the present day. "With us," says Father F. Woodlock, "the Infallibility and supremacy of the Pope rests on exactly the same authority as does that of the Godhead of Christ."[1] To measure the effect of the Vatican Decree on apologetics of this kind, we need only remind ourselves of the solemn protest of the Irish Bishops in 1826: "That it is not an article of the Catholic Faith, neither are they required to believe, that the Pope is infallible."

This brings us back to Keenan's Catechism, with its uncompromising answer to: "Must not Catholics believe the Pope in himself to be infallible?" "This is a Protestant invention," etc., etc. The details of this story are so characteristic of official Romanism, as distinguished from pious Catholicism, that we must here look into the details.

The edition of 1860 was the third, (seventeenth thousand). It was circulated with the *imprimatur* of two Vicars Apostolic and two ordinary diocesan Bishops, who commended it as specially qualified to convert the sincere Protestant and to confirm the believer in his faith.[2] After the Decree, of course it was impossible to talk of "a Protestant invention"; but the hierarchy covered their tracks with exquisite cunning. Until 1869, at any rate, the book had still been purchasable in its unexpurgated form. A couple of years later, a transformation from black to white had silently taken place. Salmon describes two copies bought at that time, and in his own library when he wrote (1888): "To all appearance they are identical in their contents. From the title page, as it appears on the paper cover of each, the two books appear to be both of the twenty-first thousand; but when we open the books, we find them further agreeing in the singular feature, that there is another title page which describes each as of the twenty-fourth thousand. But at page 112 the question and answer which I have quoted are to be found in the one book, and are absent from the other." This garbled volume was sold as a new edition "corrected by the author," though poor Keenan was by this time dead, taken away before 1870 from the evil to come.[3] These tactics were, however, exposed; and the authorities found it necessary to give some explanation. The edition of 1896 confesses itself to be "revised"; and it contains this question and answer :—

---

[1] *Guardian* of July 27th, 1923; *Church Times* of same date, repeated from similar assertion in earlier number of *Guardian* and *Morning Post*.

[2] The story is told by Salmon, pp. 26, 192; Sparrow-Simpson, pp. 110 ff; Brinckman, p. 29; Littledale, p. 199. I cannot trace that Ryder, in his professed Reply to Littledale, has a single word about this piece of evidence, which, to most unprejudiced minds, might be sufficient in itself to render the claim of 1870 absurd. Ryder must have known that Bishop Kenrick urged this at the Council itself.

"*(Q.)* But some Catholics before the Vatican Council denied the Infallibility of the Pope, which was also formerly impugned in this very Catechism.

(A.) Yes, but they did so under the usual reservation—'in so far as they then could grasp the mind of the Church, and subject to her future definitions'—thus *implicitly* accepting the dogma; had they been prepared to maintain their own opinion contumaciously in such case they would have been Catholics only in name."

The moral of this defence is well brought out by Canon Sparrow-Simpson. To put it in other words, we now know :—

(1.) That, when a Romanist Bishop officially endorses a certain teaching, this is under the reservation that it may be false, and the opposite may be true, though the faithful are given no warning.

(2.) That this "reservation" is "usual," and is applicable to all Roman Episcopal teaching.

(3.) Therefore, when the faithful reads his

---

[3] Gladstone, *Vaticanism.* Appendix D, where a correspondent records the disgust of three honest Roman Catholic booksellers who found the imposition thus practised upon them. "The utmost pains have been taken, and, I must add, with great success, to pass off this gravely altered book as being identical with the rest of the edition."

Westminster Penny Catechism, he must remember that even the sentence which seems most directly designed to confute the Protestant may be false, and that the " Protestant invention " might, within a few years, be decreed by a Council at the Vatican.

(4.) In which case, all Bishops would be bound to promulgate it on pain of deprivation. The ablest Professor now living at any Roman Catholic University—we cannot say, the man as able and learned as Döllinger, since that Church has had none equal to him since his death—but the ablest now living, who is at this moment looked upon as a Hammer of Protestants, would then have to sign his adhesion to the Protestant invention, and to unteach all that he had taught for more than forty years; or else to be cut off from what styles itself The Catholic Church. What one generation did in 1870, another might conceivably repeat; and some ignorant Pope in the future, with a strong working majority of ignorant hireling Bishops, might out-vote the 88 most instructed members of the hierarchy, and change black again into white.[4]

Yet this absurdity, like other absurdities which are sometimes found in ancient institutions, is to a great extent the product of natural and inevitable forces. A gradual subsidence of foundation in one quarter causes undue prominence in another; the deflection from the upright becomes increasingly obvious, yet the only remedy is in heroic measures; and, even at the point when a collapse seems possible any day, each successive generation may console itself with the reflection that the fabric bids fair to outlast their time, and possibly for centuries to come.

---

[4] The personal ignorance of Pius IX. in matters of history, and even sometimes of theology, was notorious. See, for instance, the dialogue in *The Expositor* for 1890, Vol. I., p. 216. *Plummer:* "The Pope is not, I believe, a learned man." *Döllinger:* "Quite the contrary, quite the contrary. He was ordained priest only as a special favour, his ignorance of the ordinary theological subjects being so great. He is the younger brother of a house of rank, and an exception was made."

Meanwhile the fact remains that the Roman foundations, in proportion as they have sunk in some directions, have risen in others. *Curialism,* to use the word which Döllinger constantly employed to distinguish the creed of the modern Roman Court from his own ancestral religion, has been favoured not only by forces from within, but also by pressure from without. The blunders of enemies, as it happens always in controversy, have helped to compact and to strengthen the defence. Men of ancient Catholic lineage have felt this most strongly; for they regret this absolutism which up-to-date Romanists, in their violent revulsion from personal or ancestral Protestantism, welcome as something which differentiates them as much as possible from the " outsider." Catholics of ancestral tradition say, with much truth, that Protestants, by branding them as Papalists, have helped to make Catholicism into a Papalist Church. Long since, it is true, Boniface VIII. had proclaimed *ex cathedra* that "all human beings are subject to the Pontiff of Rome; and we assert, define and pronounce this tenet to be essential and necessary to salvation," and Popes had persistently acted upon this assumption. But in Great Britain especially, with our ingrained habits of compromise, it would have been possible, at least for the more educated laity, to ignore many of the Papal pretensions in practice, if only Protestants had laid less emphasis upon them. Yet that emphasis was natural; it paid the Church the compliment of taking her formal claims in their literal sense; and, while for us non-Romanists it exemplifies the mistake of unsympathetic opposition, for Romanists it equally exemplifies the danger of claiming more than we can prove, and far more than we are ready to fight for. Or, in so far as it may be pleaded that these men did not so claim, but were passive instruments, it exemplifies the responsibility even of a passive instrument for things that are done in his name, and to some extent through this passive instrumentality.

It is true that we come across this dualism everywhere in life; that we cannot escape from it; that it is not only outside us but within us; that each of us in himself shows a queer contrast of theory and practice. That is true; but it does us no harm to be reminded of it; and (what is most germane to the present subject) there probably is not, nor perhaps ever has been, any institution of equal importance in which these contrasts between theory and practice are so marked as in the Roman Catholic Church of to-day. Its members insist that non-Romanists are incapable of understanding them; but we are entitled to ask seriously whether they understand themselves. Professor le Roy from within the fold, and Mr. Joseph McCabe who has now left it, agree in pointing out that even priests slide into heresy through sheer ignorance; and the ignorance of the most distinguished laymen is even greater.[5] To this last very important point I shall soon have occasion to recur.

As a matter of history, the Roman Church has been the great champion of Authority as against Liberalism for more than a thousand years; and, while this has been her strength on one side, on the other it has been her weakness. Bossuet and the Gallicans would not have dared to defy Papal despotism in politics, if they had not been supported by the equally despotic and

[5] In August, 1927, *The Atlantic Monthly* published an article which has every appearance of having been suggested by the controversy between Mr. Marshall and Governor Smith in the April and May numbers of that same review. The author, Mr. Summerfield Baldwin, calls his article: *The Crucifixion of the Catholic Mind;* he writes as one who finds his Church "the house of the Beloved, a house of rest," yet who cannot avoid certain questions. "Why," he asks, "year in and year out, are priests allowed to preach heresy and falsehood from their pulpits? The Bishop is supposed to be the pastor of his flock. Why is no surveillance exercised in this matter?" (p. 181.)

far more powerful Louis XIV. In comparison with the Infallibilists, Bossuet was a champion of freedom; but, in the light of modern thought, his subservience is startling. It has been truly said of his *Histoire Universelle* that it turns the history of the world into "a teaching of despotism for kings, and of blind obedience for peoples."[6] For him, royal authority is absolute; Princes are, as the Psalmist calls them, "gods"; the whole State is identified with the Prince; in his will, the will of the whole people is contained. And, when Louis revoked the Edict of Nantes and drove thousands of his best subjects into exile, Bossuet extolled this as an act of almost unparalleled greatness, which would shed a glory over his whole reign. Governor Smith, in his public defence of his own attitude as a Roman Catholic and as a citizen loyally subject to the American constitution, showed as much ignorance of his own Church's doctrines and traditions as the Irish Bishops did in their pleas for Emancipation.

Just as it was natural enough for Bossuet to worship authority in the seventeenth century, so the Popes have been even more naturally tempted to worship it in all ages; for there is no idolatry so easy as self-worship, or, next to that, the worship of one's own class. Solemn Papal pronouncements, in recent times, have often been explicit enough to enlighten Governor Smith, if only he had read them with sufficient care, or if he had been sufficiently interested in Benedict XV's creation of, and the present Pope's patronage of, an *Apostolic League for the Return of Nations and Peoples, and of social order in its entirety, to God and to Christ through Holy Church.*

The idea of this League came from the Redemptionist Father A. Philippe. In 1918 (Nov. 18th), Benedict XV. gave it his blessing in a formal letter through Cardinal Gasparri. The League, strong in this approbation, emphasises in leaded type the fact that the Pope wrote: "It answers, more than ever, to the grave necessities of the present day"; "It is an imperious duty for one and all" to strive for the objects which this League has in view; therefore, the Pope "wishes that all Catholics worthy of that name may join this League."[7] In 1926 (Oct. 31st), Pius XI. instituted a yearly Feast of the Church in furtherance of the objects of the League, the *Festival of Jesus Christ, King of Nations and of Societies.* The motto of the League is: *Jésus-Christ, Maître et Roi.* Its official programme points out that its main object is to fight to the death against the *Declaration of the Rights of Man.* "The great [modern] liberties of teaching, of the press, etc., are an emanation from the absolute right of man. As a matter of fact, they are the practical social expression [of this Declaration], involving, for the Country and for Society, the official non-existence of truth, of God, of Christ, and of the Church. It means the complete liberty of error, the suppression of truth and authority."

---

[6] Larousse *Gd. Dict. Universel,* Vol. II., p. 305.

All this is emphasised still more in the text of the official pamphlet. "If, in virtue of a right, a man may think what he will, then, in virtue of that same right—and this is particularly serious—he may will what he will and act as he chooses"; and thus the *Declaration* leads to anarchy. True, it does expressly limit a man's right of action by the concurrent or opposite rights of his neighbour; but Père Philippe puffs this limitation away as a proof of the freethinkers' lack of logic. (p. 29.) The fact is, modern society rests upon a basis which differs from the true basis of society as black from white. "The difference is complete. Modern Law is based on man; Catholic Law is based upon

---

[7] See the cover of the little pamphlet published officially by Père Philippe (as Superior of the League) under the title of *Le Catéchisme des Droits Divins dans l'Ordre Social.* (Paris, Boulevard de la Tour Maubourg 88. Brussels, Rue Belliard 28.) It costs about 6d. My page references are to the third edition, but these passages are printed unchanged from the first. See also *L'Europe Nouvelle* for Nov. 13th, 1926.

God." (p. 33.) But even the docile catechumen whom Père Philippe is catechising sees a "difficulty" in this, and in a good deal more stuff of the same sort to which he has been listening meanwhile. It might seem (he suggests) that "we are exposed to seeing a state of tyranny arise everywhere under the protection of the Sovereign Domain of God and of the Royalty of Christ." "But," answers Père Philippe, "that is a difficulty which unbelievers bring up against us. They seem to say to us: 'when you are masters, you are exorbitantly exacting, and we may expect anything from you. When you are not masters, you need the liberty which you refuse to others.' To judge this question soundly, we must face the true realities. These realities are, that man is here on earth to save his soul, and that he is between the terrible alternatives of being either eternally blessed or damned to all eternity. There is no middle term. Now, we know what God demands. If a man is to be saved, he must die in a state of grace. There is no greater cruelty possible towards him than to make it easier for him to lose his soul. We cannot show him any greater and more real charity than by contributing to procure his Eternal Blessedness. Now, the modern national Constitutions [*les Constitutions modernes des peuples*], by permitting and consecrating every perversion of intellect and heart, afford every facility for souls to go to hell. After this prelude, here is my own answer, in two words, to the difficulty you have proposed. (1.) Incontestably, if we were masters, we should do all we possibly could [*nous ferions l'impossible*] that no soul should be damned. (2.) We should remember that there is a difference between the Social Order and the Individual Order. In the strictly individual order, we should do no violence to consciences. If, in spite of us and in spite of all, anyone wants to lose his soul, that, at bottom, is his own business. Consequently, if anyone obstinately refused obedience to Christ and the Church, we should leave him to his conscience, provided that he caused no scandal. Evidently, we could not tolerate that the unbelief of an individual should be hurtful to the general good of a Society or a Country, or even to the particular good of a single soul. Therefore (3) we should forbid to every error and to every evil the possibility of propagating itself. That is the sense in which we should suppress the great modern liberties from the Codes and Constitutions of the Countries [of the world]. (p. 41). For to quote from an Encyclical of Leo XIII., "no man can number the multitude of souls which are lost by reason of the conditions given to Peoples by the principles of Modern Law." (p. 49.)

Here the Master, if indeed he does not equal the clearness and simplicity of the pupil's objection, does approach somewhat to the logic and lucidity which is claimed by Romanist thinkers (and, still more emphatically, by Romanists who talk more than they think) as a special theological grace of their own Church. By putting two and two together we arrive at the unavoidable conclusion that, in a State where the Pope was really supreme, religious nonconformity would be tolerated only so long as the nonconformist remained dumb. If, by breathing a word of nonconformity, he were to hinder "the particular good of a single soul," he would at once be punishable; and it is in this direction that the Codes and Constitutions of the modern world need, according to Père Philippe, serious revision.

The pupil, therefore, at last understands what the Master is driving at. (p. 63.) "In that case, we should have to enter upon a life-and-death struggle against modern theories concerning liberty and legislation; theories which are admitted by certain theologians themselves." "Just so; certain Catholics, some through courtesy and some through ignorance, do walk fully by the light of modern principles. In order to save the Catholic Faith, they assert that, practically, every opinion has a right to exist. It is their way of treating apologetics; they seem to say to unbelievers: 'we respect your faith; then, respect ours.' These Catholics forget not only the condemnations on grounds of reason which I have given above,[8] but the authoritative condemnations pronounced by the Sovereign Pontiffs against modern principles.

"Pius VII. (d. 1829) in his letter to the Bishop of Troyes, formally reprobated the introduction of modern liberties into the French Constitution. He expresses his sorrow in these terms full of anguish: 'A new subject of pain, wherewith our heart is still more deeply afflicted, and which, we confess, causes us extreme torment, prostration and anguish, is the twenty-second Article of the [French] Constitution. Not only does it permit the liberty of worship and conscience (to quote the very terms of the Article), but it promises support and protection to that liberty, and, further still, to the ministers of what it calls "worship."[9] It needs not many words, to a Bishop such as you, to make you see clearly what a mortal wound is dealt by this Article to the Catholic Religion in France. . . . . No less was our astonishment when we read the twenty-third Article, maintaining and permitting the Liberty of the Press, a liberty which threatens the greatest dangers, and certain ruin, to Faith and Morals. . . . .' "

---

[8] We must do Père Philippe the justice to say that, in these "reasons," he has been far more logical than the tolerant Catholics whom he is here combating. He has here the support of practically every orthodox writer until quite modern times. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find any orthodox Roman Catholic author before the French Revolution who could have said to Anglicans, Lutherans, Calvinists, Baptists, Independents and Greeks: "We respect your faith; respect ours."

[9] *Aux ministres de ce qu'on appelle les cultes.* A friend, long ago, told me of a little girl who, on her way from her father's house to the chapel of a great public school, passed a nonconformist place of worship, at which the service had already begun. She pointed with her thumb behind her shoulder and remarked to her mother, "There they are, singing to *their* God!"

Again, Gregory XVI. (d. 1846) writes: "From this poisoned source of indifferentism, flows the false and absurd maxim—or rather, the delirium—that we ought to procure and guarantee liberty of conscience for all men; a most contagious error, whose way is made easy by that absolute and unbridled liberty of opinion which, to the ruin of Church and State, is spreading in all directions, and which certain men, in their excess of effrontery, do not shrink from representing as advantageous for religion. . . . Connected with this is the liberty of the press, liberty most fatal, execrable liberty, which cannot be too strongly abominated, and which certain men dare so noisily and so boldly to demand everywhere."

Pius IX. (d. 1878) anathematised the following propositions: "In this age of ours, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic Religion should be considered the only State religion, excluding all other cults; therefore, in certain Catholic countries, the law has done justly to provide that immigrants into such countries may there practise publicly each his own worship."[10]

His successor, Leo XIII., in his Encyclical *Libertas,* speaks of the separation of Church and State as a pernicious and absurd idea. He goes on to denounce "that liberty, so contrary to the virtue of religion, the Liberty of Worship (as it is called), which rests upon the principle that each man is free to profess whatever religion he pleases, or even to profess none at all. . . . No, neither in justice nor in reason can the State be atheistical, or (what is equivalent to atheism) be animated by the same dispositions, as men say, to all religions, and accord the same rights to all without distinction." The force of these quotations from Leo

---

[10] This, as Philippe might have pointed out to strengthen his argument, is taken from the *Syllabus,* which many Romanists regard as an *ex cathedra* pronouncement.

XIII. is all the greater since he was looked upon as one of the most learned and broad-minded of modern Popes, and had even a certain reputation for liberalism. And, let me remind the reader again, the pamphlet from which I have been quoting, and which bases itself upon these quotations to prove that the modern conditions of free worship and a free press are pernicious, is the official manifesto of a Society which enjoys the favour of the present Pope, as it did of his predecessor. Père Philippe, whose work is so grateful to these two Popes, accepts the *Syllabus* in its plain sense, in that downright sense which the diplomatic Bishop Ketteler tried to get rid of by a falsification of the text. Père Philippe reprobates from the bottom of his heart, as Pius IX. did, the proposition that "the Roman Pontiff may, and should, reconcile himself to, and come to terms with, progress, liberalism and modern civilisation."[11]

---

[11] Ketteler, in his attempt to make this clause acceptable to thinking Catholics in Germany, wrote: "We have allowed ourselves a little liberty in the translation; we have inserted before 'progress' the little word [*das Wörtchen*] 'so-called.'" (*Deutschland nach dem Kriege, etc.*, 1867, p. 143.) It need hardly be pointed out that, under favour of a *Wörtchen* of this kind, we could drive a coach and horses through any Act of Parliament that was ever framed.

CHAPTER VII.

INFALLIBILITY IN POLITICS.

At this point, we are met with a difficulty inherent in this whole question. These things, when presented to the plain thoughtful reader in plain language, seem so incredible that he feels there must be a misconception somewhere. And this feeling is sedulously nursed by theologians who warn us daily that theirs is a very complicated and lofty science, full of pitfalls for the unwary. Here, more than in any other part of the field under discussion, the apologists have won their triumphs; they have (to quote Tyrrell's simile) produced triumphantly the dog which was reported as dead, and have thus concealed the death of the three men.

Bismarck, who by nature was plain-spoken even to bluntness, used that weapon in diplomacy more effectively, perhaps, than any other man. Over and over again he stated his political methods and his aims quite categorically, knowing that many folk, careless or misguided with respect to future contingencies, would doubt his really meaning what he said. The German military and naval staff were often equally frank as to their claims, knowing that their diplomats would smooth matters over with England and America, since (quite apart from those who had political or economic temptations to ignore war) the majority of honest folk were in that trustful mood which made the actual invasion of Belgium a brutal surprise. Professor J. H. Morgan, one of those whom it most shocked, was able to write afterwards that the German atrocities in Belgium were doubly uncivilised; not only because certain brutalities were actually practised, but also because these precise brutalities had been explained beforehand, with pedantic accuracy, by German military authorities; because what they were actually doing in Belgium received a seal of purposeful deliberation from these earlier announcements of what they would do, if circumstances required. This criticism acquires double force as coming from one who had declined, before the war, to believe that the German official theorists meant what they actually said. Again, Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P., one of the best-informed of British anti-militarists, wrote an introduction to his translation of the German book pleading for the freedom of the seas for commerce during war-time. He had to deal with Mr. Gibson Bowles, who had pointed out that, even at the Hague Conference of 1907, the German representative had practically claimed the right for military or naval necessities to rise above laws and treaties, but had added:[1] "conscience, good sense and the sentiment of duties imposed by the principles of humanity will be the surest guides for the conduct of seamen, and will constitute the most efficacious guarantee against abuse. The officers of the German navy—I say it with a high voice—will always fulfil in the strictest manner the duties which flow from the unwritten law of humanity and civilisation." Mr. Robertson, to his credit be it recorded, (though before the War he believed in this humane disclaimer as against the inhumane first principles maintained by the Germans at the Hague), said frankly and openly what he thought of actual German methods when the War had opened his eyes.

Let us apply this now to the case before us, remembering first that the discipline of the Roman Court is the nearest approach to military discipline outside any actual army; (indeed, in some ways, stricter and more effectual than any army discipline); and, secondly, that papal diplomacy has behind it a length of experience, and a continuity of tradition, in comparison with which generals and admirals and even Bismarcks are men of yesterday.

---

[1] Full details in Appendix here below.

Whenever we thus recall Romanists to the real implications of their creed, we are met with a chorus of protest. The apologists and controversialists, plausibly enough, exclaim against the folly of an amateur who undertakes to set learned specialists right. The rank and file, again, with equal show of reason, protest that we are talking about things which they themselves have never heard of; that ours is the blunder of the outsider, precluded not only by inexperience, but also by prejudice, from realising how things actually go on within the fold, yet setting up his own vain imaginings against the healthy facts. And, thirdly, a large number of sympathetic non-Romanists are more or less scandalised also. They, too, feel it presumptuous in an outsider to attempt correction of an insider—as though a Frenchman might not be a very useful critic of Britain!—and they argue, more or less consciously, that their own Romanist next-door neighbour, who in other ways is so normal and perhaps so personally sympathetic, cannot possibly be committed to such an abnormal creed.

Yet I ask the reader to read the preceding and the ensuing evidence in the light of three simple suggestions; (1) that the rank and file of any army are, in fact, committed to far more than they are capable of even imagining in times of peace; (2) that the officers, again, are committed themselves, and commit the privates, to far more than they care always to admit; and (3) that the whole army may present almost a normal civic aspect for years, or even for generations, until some crisis brings out the essential difference between the uncovenanted citizen, and the soldier who has covenanted for potentialities not contemplated in the ordinary life of a citizen.[2] Experience has taught me more and more clearly, and the facts produced in this present volume may suggest more and more clearly to the reader, that the average quiet Romanist whom we know is indeed a Catholic, but is not a Romanist at heart; that he follows his priest and his family tradition in simple piety and beneficence, and is almost as ignorant of many theological peculiarities of his creed as the average outsider; certainly, more ignorant on many points than any outsider who takes a little trouble to study the official exponents of that theology. But these official exponents, while they have one voice for their own people, have another for the outside world. The learned Cardinals Tarquini, and Billot, and Lépicier, and the equally learned Professor de Luca (to name only those who have written during my lifetime) are ready to prove to you conclusively that the Pope has a right to inflict temporal punishments for unbelief upon any baptised person whatsoever, with negligible exceptions; and they have the whole weight of Roman tradition and practice behind them. Yet the Jesuit Vermeersch, whose quotations show him to be either ignorant or dishonest, is first put up to lecture, and then translated into English, in order to assure the "outsider" of the exact opposite to that which his superiors, the Cardinals, with special papal approbation, have been teaching. It is what Dr. E. J. Dillon, in his *Fortnightly Review* article, exposed unmercifully as the "Book-keeping by Double Entry," which was being regularly practised within his own Church.

---

[2] Compare the actual case of that Territorial who, when war broke out, protested that he was a non-resister, who had joined for amusement, and without any idea of real fighting!

The problem of the real implications of the Romanist (as apart from the Catholic) creed became, quite recently, one of the most burning questions in American politics. The Presidential candidature of Governor Smith, a Romanist, raised grave doubts as to the possibility of acting quite loyally both to the Pope and to the American Constitution. Absurd attempts have been made to represent these doubts as born of Protestant bigotry and prejudice. For, in fact, they would be the first doubts to suggest themselves to any constitutional lawyer who should study the American and Roman constitutions, and should ask himself how these two could possibly agree. Again, they would at once occur to the minds of ninety per cent in France, who know what difficulties their Republic has always had.[3] For instance, Léon Chaine confesses frankly : " We Catholics have generally a great respect for the principle of authority. To our distrust of free enquiry in religious matters, we have added unconsciously the distrust of free enquiry in many other matters also "—and thus (he continues) in politics the average Catholic is naturally anti-republican.[4] " In France," writes Houtin, " until the pontificate of Leo XIII., the term ' republican ' seemed commonly incompatible with ' Catholic,' and the great majority of bishops and priests were opposed to the Republic. An ecclesiastic might pass as tolerant and liberal in his tendencies—although theological liberalism was considered a sin—but he could scarcely call himself republican without raising doubts as to the rectitude of his judgment or the honesty of his intentions."[5] The result was a widening breach between Church and State; Leo XIII. attempted to remedy this by an Encyclical in which he formally expressed his desire to see the French people rally to the Republic (Feb. 16th, 1892). This pronouncement had not all the success which the Pope had hoped. Under Pius X., there was open war again between Republic and Papacy.[6] One episode of this complicated quarrel was quite simple. A considerable number of religious congregations had grown up contrary to the State law which required, reasonably enough, that religious societies, like other societies, should ask and obtain government authorisation. Such was the law: "Successive administrations, however, had been lax in applying it: of the numerous congregations which, especially since 1870, had sprung up like mushrooms, not one in ten had complied with the requirements of the law. Opportunities have not been wanting on which, had they applied for authorisation, it would have been granted; in 1880, had they acted on the advice of the Nuncio, and joined in a declaration of loyalty to the institutions of the country, they might have acquired legal standing. They refused; and, under the circumstances, the refusal was equivalent to a declaration of war not only against the Republic but against the State. Warned in 1898 of the impending legislation, they hardened their hearts. They depended, they answered, on the Pope, not on the Government; to apply to the latter to legalise their position would be to give to Caesar the things that were God's. The Law of 1901 gave the alternative of authorisation or dissolution. Many chose the latter; and the submission of those who at the eleventh hour retreated from a position which they found untenable was badly received. Irritated by their long resistance, and taught by experience to see in their policy and existence a menace to society, the attitude of the Chamber was hostile. The congregations, as such, were suspect. Of the unauthorised orders of men six only obtained authorisation; the tardy demands of the majority were rejected without examination and *en bloc*. That the innocent suffered with the guilty is probable. 'Tu l'as voulu, Georges Dandin.' To associate oneself with evildoers is to share their ill-repute, and often their fall."

---

[3] Döllinger shows, by a number of historical examples, that the incompatibility of true Romanism with anything like a liberal State Constitution is not only theoretical but practical. (Janus, pp. 22—23. Compare Abbé Lugas in *Dublin Review,* April, 1928.)

[4] Chaine, p. 275.

[5] *Mod. Cath.,* p. 16.

[6] For this and the next points, see Fawkes, pp. 104 ff, 120 ff, 136; de Narfon, *Séparation,* pp. 113, 175, 305ff; *Ce qu'on a fait de l'Eglise passim;* see index; Pernot, Chapter XV.

In this quarrel, which led to the separation of Church and State in France, it is not possible to defend all the acts of the Government; but the point is that those of Rome were often still more indefensible. The Pope denied the right of the French to be masters in their own house; he allowed himself to be guided by his Secretary of State, Cardinal Merry del Val, a delight-ful man but an unscrupulous diplomatist,[7] who, while disclaiming all interference in French politics, kept a hired spy in Paris, Mgr. Montagnini, and another press reptile of the name of Benigni. The Government, in 1906, exercised their right of seizing Montagnini's papers; and their publication dealt to the credit of the Roman Court one of the most serious blows which it has suffered in our time. Tyrrell, in 1907, wrote to a French friend: "Again, I have felt the moral badness of Rome and the Curia so deeply and acutely these late years that I cannot take active service, as a priest, under such a *canaille.* I feel as a French monarchist officer who throws up his commission rather than serve under a government of *apaches.* The Montagnini and the Benigni revelations have extinguished every spark of respect for the present *personnel* of the Roman See. . . . . There must be a *debâcle.* After that, perhaps, a reconstruction. The root error was in 1870. Condense all power into the hands of one man, who may be a fool or a knave, and what can you expect? It would be a miracle if things were otherwise, and miracles don't happen."[8]

These things throw a side-light on the American question; but there is more direct evidence to hand. In the summer of 1892, Mgr. Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul, gave a series of addresses in Paris which caused a sensation. He celebrated American freedom, and insisted that in America Catholics also were showing the way to freedom. Next year, in his preface to the *Life of Father Hecker,* he put the same ideas rather more definitely. Liberal Catholics, seeing or thinking that they saw a revival here of the generous aspirations of Lamennais and Lacordaire, seized upon these ideas; and there was much talk of "Americanism" as a new and hopeful movement. This feeling was naturally strongest in the United States themselves. "Americanists in America have a way of their own in boasting of their religious liberties. If we are to believe them, the State would seem a greater thing than the Church; and they would seem Americans first, and Catholics afterwards."[9] Strict Romanists insisted on the danger of this: "The Catholics of the United States, in order to gain favour with their fellow-citizens, and to show them their breadth of mind, had allowed themselves to be drawn into blameworthy concessions; this was the 'concessionist' heresy. Its leaders were evidently Archbishop Ireland, Cardinal Gibbons and Bishop Spalding."[10] Presently, something far more serious came than the mere murmurs of the orthodox. In 1898, Abbé Maignen published a book criticising Father Hecker and his school, and it appeared with the *imprimatur* of the Master of the Sacred Palace; i.e. of the Pope's own censor; again, the English edition was furnished also with an approving letter from Cardinal Satolli.[11] The book disgusted Americans; most of the Bishops were more or less in agreement with Archbishop Ireland, and the great Romanist publishing firm of Benziger Bros., "printers to the Apostolic See," refused to allow their name on the title page. In France, however, the faithful received Maignen's book with increasing favour. And at last (Jan. 22nd, 1899), the Pope breathed upon Americanism and it was scattered; *afflavit Deus, et dissipati sunt.*[12] In an open letter addressed to "Our well-beloved son, James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore," Leo XIII. expressed his appreciation of American Catholicism, but made it quite plain that Rome had no use for "Americanism." The *Life of Hecker,* he says, has given rise to violent controversies; the Pope, there-

---

[7] Frederick Rolfe, who enjoys now a good deal of posthumous fame under that name of Baron Corvo which he often chose for his books, told me that the Cardinal's nickname among the English theological students in Rome was *Merry Devil.*

[8] *Mod. Cath.* p. 17; Houtin, *L'Américanisme,* pp. 205—212.

[9] Houtin, *Américanisme,* p. 281.
[10] *Ibid.,* p. 287.
[11] *Ibid.,* pp. 301—2.
[12] *Ibid.,* p. 325

fore, takes this occasion of reprobating certain new opinions which are contained in, or which some men read into, this book. "The new opinions whereof we speak, rest, briefly, upon this principle: that the Church, in order more easily to bring separatists back to Catholic doctrine, should adapt herself increasingly to the civilisation of a grown-up epoch, and, relaxing her ancient severity, should make some concessions to the principles newly introduced among nations. And this, (as many think), should be understood not only of the rule of life, but also of doctrines, which contain the Deposit of Faith." The Church, he continues, has always taken account of the circumstances of her age in her efforts to save souls; she has made exceptions in certain cases; "these cases, however, must be decided not by the judgment of private persons, who are often deceived by appearances of good; they must be reserved for the judgment of the Church." Did not Pius VI., long ago (1794) formally condemn the seventy-eighth proposition of the Council of Pistoia, "because it submits to examination the discipline approved and established by the Church; as if it were possible for the Church to establish a useless discipline, too heavy for Christian liberty to bear." There is no harm in "Americanism" if the word describes "only certain gifts of mind which honour the American people, as other gifts honour other nations; or, again, if it refers to the Constitution of your States, the laws and manners which reign among you. But, if the word is used to name and distinguish with praise the abovementioned doctrines, it is not doubtful that our venerable brethren the Bishops of America will be the first to repudiate and condemn it, as extremely injurious for themselves and their whole nation; for it would lead to suppose that there are people among you who dream and hope that the Church may be different in America from what she is in the other countries of the world."

To all who know what the Roman Church is in other countries, those words are plain enough. The American Bishops had no heart to fight, and they came to heel like spaniels.

In the face of these things, what had Governor Smith to say? This may be read in the May number of *The Atlantic Monthly* for 1927, where he formally answered an open letter addressed to him in the previous number by a lawyer, Mr. C. E. Marshall. Mr. Marshall has returned again to the charge in a book[13] which admirably exposes the statements and arguments of Governor Smith, or rather, of the clerics who briefed him. The Governor's personal honesty is, as it should be, his greatest asset; and he confesses in his preface: "I call your attention to the fact that I am only a layman. . . . I am neither a lawyer nor a theologian. . . . . It seemed right, therefore, to take counsel with someone schooled in the Church law, from whom I learned whatever is hereafter set forth in definite answer to the theological questions you raise." This is the Rev. Father Duffy, who, it appears, gained four high distinctions for bravery in the late war.

But why (it may be asked to begin with), did he need to consult this theological and military expert? Here is a man of high character, great ability, long and wide practical experience in politics, standing as candidate for the supreme office in his native country, yet unable to answer, without help from a theologian, certain plain questions as to how he would behave if certain conflicts took place, on well known and highly debatable points, between the constitution of his own country and the principles of another State, to which he professes the same allegiance, heartfelt and complete, as to the United States.[14] Those questions are obvious; no man could have a right to stand for the Presidency who had not a clear answer to them. When Governor Smith admitted that it needed a trained theologian to supply materials for his answer, he thereby confessed that a Roman Catholic's obedience to his own country's Constitution (the one point here in question) depends upon specialist theological dogmas.

---

[13] *The Roman Catholic Church in the Modern State.* New York, Dodd Mead and Co., 1928. (2nd Ed. since published.)

[14] It must never be forgotten that the whole Roman position rests upon the fundamental thesis that their Church is a Perfect State, in the Aristotelian sense adopted by St. Thomas Aquinas and echoed by all orthodox theologians since his time. For the Pope, to abandon his claim to be the ruler of a Perfect State would be suicidal.

Secondly, nobody who reads the article with any care can fail to see that a great deal of what Governor Smith and his priestly adviser wrote in answer to Mr. Marshall's clear and searching questions is simply irrelevant; and that theology entirely fails to meet some of the most natural objections which at once occur to a constitutional lawyer. The Governor pleads his own personal honesty and admirable past record in government; he pleads that, whereas two Romanists have been Chief Justices, nobody has suggested their dishonesty; he goes on to " recall the tens of thousands of young Catholics who have risked and sacrificed their lives in defence of our country." All this would be valid against any rabid Orangeman who refused all good whatever to Roman Catholicism; but it says nothing whatever to thoughtful people who wonder how a President could possibly render loyal allegiance, simultaneously, to two States which possess two of the most widely divergent constitutions in this present world. And the clap-trap with which he tries to escape from discussion is not only so false in theology but so repugnant to common sense, that in this case we cannot really cast all the blame upon Father Duffy alone. Governor Smith writes: " The essence of my faith is built upon the Commandments of God. The law of the land is built upon the Commandments of God. There can be no conflict between them." Has Governor Smith lived all these years, amid all this healthy religious and political activity, without discovering that some of the deadliest quarrels in the world have come from rival interpretations of one and the same commandment? What would he answer to a Protestant who should retort his own formula upon him? "Protestantism and Catholicism are alike built upon the Commandments of God; therefore, there can be no conflict between them."

Moreover, when he comes to more technical points of theology, he makes statements which can be excused only by his own ignorance and by Father Duffy's desperate necessities.[15] One of the most damning testimonies, as we have seen, is the fact that Pius IX., in his *Syllabus,* solemnly anathematised, as pestilent errors, the ideas that (1) every man is free to embrace and confess the religion which reason seems to point out as true, or (2) that the Roman Church has no right to employ physical force, or (3) that Roman Catholicism has no right to exclude other forms of worship, or (4) that the Pope can and should reconcile himself to modern civilisation. Mr. Marshall naturally pressed these and similar proclamations from Papal Encyclicals upon the Governor, who, in reply, takes the astounding position that a Roman Catholic owes no more obedience to the voice of a Pope, than Mr. Marshall does in religion to every statement of an Episcopal Bishop, or in politics to every statement of a President of the U.S.A.[16] And, coming to details, he asserts: "The

---

[15] I make here the observation which is perpetually needed in dealing with Romanist arguments; I take the writer's *rhetorical question* as equivalent to a *statement.* When, for instance, Governor Smith asks, "By what right do you ask me to assume responsibility for every statement that may be made in a [Papal] encyclical letter?" I take him to repudiate all such responsibility; that is obviously the meaning which the question is intended to convey, and those who write thus must expect to be thus understood.

[16] This is the only possible interpretation to be put upon his words, p. 724. It is true, his exact phrase is "every statement coming from a prelate"; but the only "prelate" in this discussion, as the context plainly shows, is the Pope, and, unless Governor Smith not only included the Pope here, but is referring mainly to the Pope, then he would be (what is inconceivable from his character) wilfully deceiving his readers. This matter is so important that I quote his words *in extenso* in my Appendix.

Syllabus of Pope Pius IX., which you quote on the possible conflict between Church and State, is declared by Cardinal Newman to have 'no dogmatic force.'" So far he is correct; but he strangely omits to add that Newman, (not yet Cardinal), was on that account, among others, suspected of unorthodoxy; and that Cardinal Manning, who to the last was as much favoured at the Roman Court as Newman was suspected, held the *Syllabus* to be an infallible utterance, binding in faith.[17] This, to be sure, is still an open question in the Roman Church; and outsiders are naturally amused to note that men who are so certain of the Pope's Infallibility are so painfully uncertain as to the infallibility of his specially solemn utterances on subjects most directly concerned with faith and morals. But, amidst all these uncertainties, it is abundantly certain that Governor Smith's reply can be acquitted of dishonesty only on the plea of profound ignorance. Probably the most up-to-date book on this subject is that of Lucien Choupin, Doctor of Theology and of Canon Law, and Professor of Canon Law at the Roman Catholic College of Ore.[18] While emphasising the doubts as to whether these articles of the *Syllabus* are actually, as Manning contended, articles of the Catholic Faith, and, therefore, binding under pain of flat heresy, Choupin shows beyond all reasonable doubt that they are binding upon the conscience of every good Romanist. He writes on p. 101 (italics his): " [The *Syllabus,*] being in itself a pontifical document, addressed to the Church Universal on *matters of doctrine* (on this point there is no dispute among doctors), it demands, to begin with, in the forum externum, the *exterior* deference of every Catholic. Therefore, one cannot reject its authority, or publicly contradict the doctrine which it contains, without grievous fault [*sans faute grave*]. That is the elementary prerogative of the legislative power [of the Pope]; that is its undoubted right. But does the *Syllabus* also claim interior adhesion? The present question is simply as follows. Setting aside Infallibility for the purpose of this argument [*footnote:* 'I treat this question in Chapter III.'], what submission of conscience is required by a canonical document of the nature of the *Syllabus?* We shall answer: The same kind of inward submission, the same *religious assent* which is due to a doctrinal sentence emanating directly from the supreme Magisterium of the Sovereign Pontiff. Therefore this is not, as some seem sometimes to say, a case in which each man keeps his *liberty of appreciation.* Every Catholic is seriously bound to give this *religious assent* to the Pontifical document. To refuse this adhesion would constitute *a grievous sin of temerity.* We must except the case, necessarily rare, in which a man might have certain evidence to the contrary. But, as a matter of fact [*dans l'espèce*] this hypothesis is rather theoretical" [than practical]. He goes on to rehearse how, "whether gathered in provincial and national Synods, or speaking individually, the Bishops of Italy and France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Spain, Belgium, Holland, North and South America, sent their adhesion to Pius IX., and set the *Syllabus* before their flocks as *an obligatory rule of doctrine, come from the Holy See;* they protested against the public powers who wished to prevent the publication of these documents. Father Rinaldi has conscientiously made a list of all their documents and their circulars. We will show presently how far this argument goes from their moral unanimity. Let it suffice to note, for the moment, that such a demonstration of the Catholic Episcopate would be truly incomprehensible if, (as some think) the *Syllabus* was a mere anonymous catalogue, which of itself, had neither *special authority* nor *obligatory* force." Choupin goes on to quote an allocution of Pius IX. and an encyclical of Leo XIII., with other papal pronouncements, which definitely held up the *Syllabus* to the faithful as a "*rule of teaching*"; "the doctrinal *standard* which the faithful must follow." He might have added that the well known German Archbishop Fischer proclaimed the *Syllabus* as "the touchstone of our age."[19] Indeed, the Papal Congregation of the Index has made it into such a touchstone. In June, 1898, it decided that any book which maintained or defended the errors condemned in the *Syllabus* must be counted, *ipso facto,* among books forbidden to the faithful as containing errors reproved by the Apostolic See. Choupin rightly treats this as conclusive, even though there had been no other evidence; and he adds: "*Conclusion.* The *value of the Syllabus as law* would therefore be perfectly certain in itself. However, Roman jurisprudence, the suffrage of the Catholic Episcopate, and the declarations of Pius IX. and Leo XIII. corroborate, with the highest authority, the thesis which I have tried to prove." (p. 104.) In the next chapter, he shows how the doctors who enjoyed most reputation under Pius IX. were preponderantly in favour of the *infallible* character of the *Syllabus;* and how even those who denied its *ex cathedra* character "affirmed that it is beyond doubt an authentic act of the Sovereign Pontiff, of universal obligation upon the faithful." I may add that the Jesuit, Brors, who, in his little apologetic manual, always goes as far as possible to attract non-Romanists by minimising objections, has no doubt that "it is forbidden to Catholics to hold the errors mentioned"; therefore, "the knowledge of the *Syllabus* is specially important in our day."[20]

---

[17] Ward's *Life of Newman,* Vol. II., p. 151.

[18] *Valeur des Décisions Doctrinales et Disciplinaires du Saint Siège.* Paris, 1907.

Most important, certainly, it would have been for this prospective President, and for Father Duffy upon whom he relies, to learn about the *Syllabus,* a document which, after all, is fairly familiar even to a good many non-Romanists, as one of the most solemn pronouncements ever made by any Pope. Indeed, the Governor has been publicly rebuked for his attitude by an organ of his own Church. He had written, in answer to Mr. Marshall, " So little are these matters of the essence of my faith that I, a devout Catholic since childhood, never heard of them until I read your letter." Here he writes with obvious sincerity, but with the valour of ignorance. He is an admirable instance of the distinction which I am making all through this book, the distinction between the devout Catholic, who troubles himself very little about Papal claims, and the Romanist proper, who accepts them for himself and presses them upon us. If a man wishes seriously to defend Romanism, he must learn what Romanism really teaches; he must not try to make his own accidental ignorance into the standard of truth and falsehood. This, as Mr. Marshall tells us (p. 90), was realised by one of Governor Smith's own allies. " A New York editor had said, ' They [the Encyclicals] do not bind American Catholics, as is shown by the fact that the Governor never heard of them.' ' The statement as it stands,' said *America,* is gravely erroneous.' " And in an article on the subject, this well known Roman Catholic journal expounded the orthodox doctrine, saying: "A Papal Encyclical invariably demands from Catholics, first, respect, in view of the source from which it emanates, and, next, absolute obedience. . . . Hence the genuine Catholic at once yields respect and obedience."

---

[19] Goetz, *Ultramontanismus,* p. 76.

[20] F. X. Brors, S.J. *Modernes A.B.C.,* § 238. (Kevelaer, revised edition, 111th—120th thousand, 1902.) Mr. Marshall, (p. 90).

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FAITH OF GOVERNOR SMITH.

GOVERNOR SMITH, therefore, with all his years of honourable service to the State, and Father Duffy, with his four military decorations, have, by this time, either made humble submission to their ecclesiastical superiors, or they are no genuine Catholics. Unless they are prepared to yield outward consent to the *Syllabus* in the *forum externum,* that is, to obey it as a law, to obey it as they obey the laws of the United States—then they are in "grievous fault." If, again, even while prepared to obey it outwardly, they are unable to school themselves to inward assent—to the belief that the Pope's words must *be* right, though they may not *seem* right—then, for want of that necessary inward assent, they are in "a grievous sin of temerity." This is, emphatically, not a case in which Catholics "keep their liberty of appreciation." The Pope has spoken plainly; therefore, thenceforward they have no such liberty. They are not quite heretics, no doubt, yet at least no theologian could fail to warn them that the assertion of this forbidden liberty must seriously increase their chance of purgatorial pains after death. Grievous temerity may not count for much in New York State, but it will count for a great deal in that world in which neither American law nor Fr. Duffy can afford any protection whatsoever.

Indeed, it would become serious even in New York, if ever a political crisis came; not only a crisis in the relations between Church and State, but a crisis in the Church herself. Miss Petre, a laywoman just as Governor Smith is a layman, found this to her cost; her crime was that she, an able and well-educated Catholic, knew these things of which Governor Smith confesses his ignorance; we may almost say, of which the Governor boasts his ignorance, since that ignorance is exalted into one of his most convincing arguments against the deluded Protestant Marshall. We have seen how, in 1899, she was called upon by her Bishop to subscribe to the Encyclical *Pascendi* and the similar Papal Decree *Lamentabili;* on her refusal, he cut her off from the Sacraments of the Church within the whole of his diocese. Not only would all other Bishops have been able to take the same measures against her, but it is probable that only her personal distinction saved her elsewhere; other Bishops naturally shrank from the scandal of excommunicating a member of one of the oldest Catholic families in Great Britain, whose ancestors suffered for their faith in the days when Governor Smith's were probably (at least a good many of them) "heretics." The Governor's attitude towards the *Syllabus* was, in fact, adopted, in 1904, by Paul Viollet, one of the most distinguished Catholic historians in France, who succeeded in getting an *imprimatur* from the Archbishop of Besançon. He pleaded that, in certain cases, it was possible to hold one of the propositions condemned in that *Syllabus*, without being "*ipso facto,* a heretic, accursed and excluded from the fold of the Church."[1] He asked, "Is the Pope, then, the irreconcilable enemy of those liberties and rights which, in the United States, and England and other States, guarantee security, prosperity and peace to Catholics?" Again, "the Pope's real thoughts were distorted, and an involuntary scandal was caused, on the day on which the hand which drew up the *Syllabus* stigmatised as an error the proposition that 'the Roman Pontiff may and should reconcile himself to, and make terms with, progress, liberalism and modern civilisation.'" Doctor Rifaux, quoting this, adds: "This commentary [of Viollet] upon the *Syllabus,* this commentary so precise, so clear, so loyal, and, let us add, so authorised, will, we hope, dispel all ambiguities. It will reassure the uneasy consciences of certain Christians who (to quote Paul Viollet) 'are kept from entering Catholicism by mistaken notions concerning the Papacy.'" It would be difficult to write more reassuringly than this good Catholic, Dr. Rifaux, thus wrote in 1907; he claimed, as clearly as this Smith-Duffy manifesto claims, that those who believe in progress, liberalism and civilisation need not worry themselves about the *Syllabus*. Yet, within a few months of the moment when Rifaux quoted Viollet's explanations as convincing, and even as "authorised," they were officially condemned at Rome! Viollet was not even granted a hearing; his book was placed upon the Index, and he obediently submitted. If any sufficiently conspicuous American Romanist dared to publish a similar book tomorrow, it would meet with the same fate. Yet, in controversy with Protestants, Viollet's argument will be freely used still, so long as Rome herself can manage conveniently to wink at the falsehoods pleaded in her name. If any outsider contradicts Viollet, as the Pope did, and insists on giving that force to the *Syllabus* which Rome herself gives, and draws the necessary logical conclusion that no man can be faithful both to modern liberal constitutions and to the *Syllabus*, he will be held up by English and American apologists as an example of Protestant ignorance or bigotry.

---

[1] Rifaux, *Agonie,* pp. 265 ff; *Mod. Cath.,* p. 146.

We need not follow Governor Smith and Father Duffy in detail through their other points, serious as some of these are. Their quibbles about the school question, for instance, are admirably exposed by Mr. Marshall in his fifteenth chapter. The blunders of these two distinguished Romanists are sometimes of a kind which might be natural in an outsider; but they suggest a curious psychological problem when we remember that they come from official defenders of a creed which claims to be precise and logical beyond all others. Yet there is one portion of the Smith article so important, and so easy to test, that it must not be left unnoticed.

Governor Smith ends with a profession of faith: "I summarise my creed as an American Catholic." This runs to half a page, and I quote it in my Appendix. But I feel convinced that this "creed of an American Catholic" would not be publicly endorsed by any high and responsible ecclesiastical authority, in the plain sense which the words convey to careful and intelligent readers. The last sentence, for instance, is intended to convey the impression that the writer not only dislikes being criticised himself as a Roman Catholic, but also that he hopes there will never be a day in which Americans look upon Protestants as less useful citizens than Roman Catholics; and that he deprecates any suggestion of a man's religious creed impairing his usefulness to the State. For, if different religious creeds do in fact make a difference in citizenship, then it is not only permissible but just to point out this fact; and Roman Catholics, when religious differences are urged against them, are not persecuted innocents, set up as a butt to bigotry, but simply citizens who will do wisely to remain patient under those same conditions which are imposed upon all other citizens. One thing alone can redeem this last sentence, from the pen of this fundamentally honest man, from the suspicion that it is a piece of mere political clap-trap. If he believes, in his soul, that Protestants and Agnostics are, on the whole, as good citizens as Roman Catholics, then he had a right to print those words. But if, on the other hand, he is convinced, as most of us are convinced, that a man's religion does affect, to some appreciable degree, his usefulness, and that one religion is better than another, then it is mere thoughtlessness or political hypocrisy for him to deprecate any allusion to these beliefs in political discussion. Unconsciously (I cannot help thinking), Governor Smith has fallen here into one of the meanest of Romanist tricks. The Pope, his Court, his officers down to the very lowest, and the great mass of those who follow him, assert to each other, and maintain against us whenever it suits their purpose, the most absolute claims of supremacy which are recorded in the whole history of the human race. Moreover, they assert claims not only positive but negative; the ancient Greek did not so definitely repudiate the Barbarians, or the Chinese Mandarin the Foreign Devils, as Popes have sometimes denied salvation, or even moral virtues in any effective sense, to non-Romanists. Yet, at other moments, when we embarrass them by taking them at their word, they hold out the hat for our charity: "Are we not Christians like yourselves? Why, then, do you not treat us exactly as you treat all other Christians?" Let me quote here from an author with whom, for once, I am glad to agree, since I feel as strongly as he does that the question of Religion or non-Religion is, after all, the main factor in human life and human history. Mr. Hilaire Belloc has written (and it was in America, I believe, that he wrote it): "The Catholic Church is in its root principle at issue with the Civic definition both of freedom and of authority. For the purpose of the State, religion is either a universally admitted system, or a matter of individual choice. But, by the definition which is the very soul of Catholicism, religion must be for the Catholic *First*, a supreme authority superior to any claims of the State."[2] Again, as *The Catholic Encyclopædia* puts it: "In case of direct contradiction, making it impossible for both jurisdictions to be exercised, the jurisdiction of the [Roman] Church prevails, and that of the State is excluded."[3]

But I find, by long experience, that Romanists have always one last ditch of defence. When we pin them down with the plainest contradictions from their own official or semi-official pronouncements, they reply that, to the faithful, there is no contradiction: non-Romanists (they say) can never understand either the philosophy or the general mentality of a Romanist.

---

[2] *The Contrast,* p. 160, quoted by Marshall, p. 37.

[3] Vol. XIV., p. 251; quoted by Marshall, pp. 34, 274.

That argument is generally as unanswerable as a similar protest would be from a Bolshevik and a Mormon; and, of course, in all these cases, there is a certain amount of truth. But in this question of conflicts between obedience to the Pope and obedience to any modern Constitution (for, practically, the *Syllabus* tars all modern Constitutions with the same brush) we can really apply something like a conclusive test.

Governor Smith's diocesan, his Judge Ordinary, is the Archbishop of New York. Governor Smith has given the utmost publicity in his power to this his *Confession of Faith as an American Catholic.* If that confession is in any respect faulty, that is a very serious thing for his Church, and still more serious for the immediate ecclesiastical authority concerned. The Archbishop cannot here shelter himself behind Governor Smith's own plea for mercy: *he* is not a mere layman, ignorant of Theology and Canon Law; nor, again, can the Archbishop take shelter behind Father Duffy's military decorations. There is a guilty silence which is quite as harmful, before God and man, as any guilty speech; a strict and solemn account must be rendered by any prelate who, knowingly, allows error to be published in his diocese, in circumstances which would not only bring the words home to thousands but which would also give to those words a strict, even if undeserved, appearance of reality and truth. The Archbishop may possibly not have seen Governor Smith's *Credo;* but I am sending him by registered post a copy of this present volume, with a covering letter directing his attention to this page, and to the following question: "Can he, publicly and unequivocally, assure us that Governor Smith's *Profession,* which I reprint verbally in my Appendix, is, in the plain sense in which it will have been understood by the large majority of educated and thoughtful readers, entirely orthodox? If not, will he briefly but clearly indicate—or, better still, condescend to correct—those clauses for which, as Archbishop, he could not vouch?"

April 2nd, 1931.

It is to-day exactly ten weeks since I posted both to the Archbishop of New York and to Governor Alfred Smith, in separate registered envelopes, the challenge which will be found on pp. 104—5 of this volume. Neither recipient has answered or even acknowledged my letter; I must, therefore, leave my readers to draw their own conclusions.

G. G. COULTON.

I am sending another copy, with similar indications to this page, to Governor Smith; and I shall take the earliest opportunity of letting my readers know, by a slip inserted at this point, whether the Archbishop can vouch for the Governor's orthodoxy, or whether we have here only one more instance of facts cooked in one way for the inner ring of the faithful, and in very different ways for outside apologetic purposes.

For Governor Smith's attitude earlier in his article, with regard to Papal Encyclicals, the Archbishop certainly would not dare to vouch. The same may be said for those quotations from American prelates which Governor Smith brings forward to prove the political independence of American Romanists. Every one of those whom he quotes—Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Spalding, Bishop Ireland, was more or less directly rebuked by the Roman Court, at one time or another; and all came obediently to heel.

I have dealt at great length with this American incident, not only because the problem it raises is fundamental, but also because it so clearly illustrates the contrast between Romanist and non-Romanist claims, Romanist and non-Romanist methods. Governor Smith is, by the admission of his adversaries, a man of high personal integrity. He was simply ignorant of the most definite political commitments of his own Church; and the "specialist" in whom he trusted was either equally ignorant—for the most appalling ignorance is possible even in high quarters—or lacked the Governor's own honesty. And if it be pleaded that, after all, it does not matter what absurd claims the hierarchy maintain, so long as these are ignored by the honest practical lay politicians of their own Church, then we must answer that it does matter a great deal. In fact, some of the worst political or social abuses have originated in, or been maintained by, honest tools in the hands of a clique of extremists. It is to the interest of all true Catholics to have their eyes opened to the things to which they are committed in the background, even though there may appear no danger lest those things should be brought forward into practical politics within our own generation. Ignorance of one's serious commitments, or indifference to those commitments, may be counted among the worst diseases of any society. If this book of mine does nothing else, it may serve to remind a few thinking Catholics of their formal commitments. And, if they plead that these, in our present twentieth century, have become purely formal, and therefore negligible, let them obtain from some recognised authority within their own Church a public and unequivocal assurance of this plea. Let it be publicly admitted, *by competent authorities,* that the doctrines and practices which I have cited are now empty formalities, which may be so completely disregarded by Catholics as to leave no reasonable room for Protestant criticism.

I have underlined *by competent authorities;* for there lies the real crux. No diplomacy has ever known so well as the Roman how to use tools and disavow them when the work is done. It may be said, with the strictest truth, that Governor Smith's ignorance has been an even more valuable asset to the Roman cause than his honesty and his great political services. It is not only that his theological assertions came with enormously more weight from him than from an Archbishop, concerning whom men might have said that he was professionally bound to stand up in defence of these things. Still more important was this, that the Governor was able to make, quite honestly, reassuring assertions which the Archbishop would not dare to make. The honesty of the man carried off the dishonesty of his appeal to the public.[4] We have here a very remarkable precedent in the Forged Decretals. That falsification did, for one moment, stagger a few scholars; but then Pope Nicholas I., in a famous letter which was afterwards incorporated in Canon Law, reassured the public. The forger had done like many other astute tricksters; he had "salted" his mass of false documents with a sprinkling of genuine. When, therefore, doubters appealed to the Pope, he replied that the unquestionably genuine documents in this collection lent force and authority to those which might otherwise have been doubtful. He himself was in all probability among those who were deceived by the forgery; for, great Pope though he was, his scholarship was on a par with his logic. But the fabrications served their turn; for centuries and centuries, a man might as lawfully be burned for persistently repudiating these Decretals compiled by this anonymous forger, as for questioning the Bible. And, now that they are unmasked and, therefore, disavowed, we non-Romanists are accused of ignorance and prejudice for attaching any importance to the forgery; the incident is closed! So is it in this American business. Governor Smith, from the point of view of an orthodox Romanist, has less authority to speak on this all-important subject than the most ignorant priest. The priest, again, were he the most learned in the world, has no authority here as against his Bishop; nor has the Bishop as against the Roman Congregations, nor they as against the Pope. The situation is put in a nutshell by an orthodox Frenchman. "The Catholic Church is composed of the faithful who are in communion with their priests, of priests in communion with their bishops, and of bishops in communion with the Pope. The Pope, at the apex of the hierarchy, wields a sovereign power which extends over the whole Catholic world. Any association which did not conform to the rules of this discipline would not be a Catholic, but a schismatic association."[5] At every

---

[4] I must repeat here that, throughout this book, when I use plain words like *dishonest, false, mendacious,* their application is purely literary. Men otherwise honest have written dishonest books; the reader must remember Lord Acton's distinction: men may, for a Cause, publish what they know to be false, but not "become habitual liars in other things." (*Correspondence,* p. 43.)

[5] Quoted by J. de Narfon, *Séparation,* p. 183.

step, *communion* here depends upon *obedience;* disobey, and you are cut off, provided that you are unrepentant, and that the matter is important enough to attract serious notice. Therefore, however attractive a layman's words may be to outsiders, they will lose all significance from the moment when it may suit the clergy to repudiate him. He may have been the most persuasive of decoy-ducks; but, if policy requires it, his neck will be wrung and he will go into the pot. Ferdinand Brunetière was as enthusiastic in his religion as Governor Smith, and a far abler man at this particular job. He was Editor of the greatest Review in the world, the *Revue des Deux Mondes.* In intellectual force and culture he was far superior to those journalists of to-day who expound Romanism to us and who abuse us for our ignorance of Catholic realities. He had spent years in attempting to present Romanism in a light which should make it possible for intelligent young men; and his success had been considerable. He never ventured, I believe, to go quite so far to meet doubters as Governor Smith goes in his *Atlantic Monthly;* yet his final fate was to be condemned, not indeed actually by name, but so clearly that nobody doubted who was intended, in the Papal Encyclical *Pascendi.* The blow was so rude that a Jesuit Father wrote, in the principal journal of Jesuit France: "There is no doubt that Brunetière is here intended. Six months ago, anyone who had permitted himself language of this kind to Brunetière would have been stoned by half the Catholics. Yet Truth dwells in Rome!"[6]

What a Romanist layman tells us, therefore, is negligible except so far as he can support it by authoritative pronouncements of his Church. When, as often happens, he is trying to persuade us that those pronouncements do not really mean what, in plain English or still plainer Latin, they seem to mean, then he is playing a part so futile that it is difficult to understand how he himself can take it seriously. The bishop—or even the nearest priest—has only to breathe upon him, and the nullity of the most distinguished Romanist layman becomes apparent at once. It is small consolation to him to reflect that the Bishop himself, behind the façade of his mitre and his pontificals, is almost as null, and that the only man who could give real assurance would be this Pope, whose decrees it is the main preoccupation of reasonable Catholics to explain away. What did it avail that the whole English episcopate had given solemn assurance to the English Parliament against the Papal claim to Infallibility? or that Keenan, with four Bishops of whom two were Vicars Apostolic, had denounced the stress laid upon it as a calumny? That majority which overawed the Vatican Council did not even deign to listen; the American Archbishop who wished to remind them of these things was not even allowed to deliver his speech.

---

[6] *Mod. Cath.,* p. 182, quoted from *Etudes,* 5th Dec., 1907, p. 657.

We need not appeal to the *Syllabus* alone, in order to show that those who attempt to reconcile Romanism with Liberalism, Progress and Modern Civilisation are weaving ropes of sand. Here is one of the most illogical among those many illogical ideas which confront us whenever we attempt to penetrate the real tenets of this denomination which claims to be so severely logical. If apologists would spend their energies in contrasting Romanism with Liberalism, Progress and Civilisation, and in attempting to prove its superiority to those modern delusions, they could at least maintain consistency. But the attempt to patch up compatibility between these incompatibles is, under analysis, as absurd in reason as it is contradictory to Papal Decrees and Papal practice for the last thousand years.

When Pius IX. rejected all appeal to healthy Catholic tradition with the words "*I* am Tradition," he was only claiming what a large number of the faithful had long been accustomed to attribute to the Pope. Cardinal Bellarmine shares with Bossuet the reputation of greatest among all Roman controversialists. He has lately been beatified, and will doubtless pass on presently, in the ordinary course, to Saint. He argued seriously that the Pope cannot possibly err in his definitions within the moral sphere; " for then [the Church] would necessarily err even concerning faith. For the Catholic faith teaches that all virtue is good and all vice is evil; but if the Pope erred, by commanding vices or by forbidding virtues, then the Church would be bound to believe vices to be good and virtues evil, unless she should sin against her own conscience. For in doubtful matters the Church is bound to acquiesce in the judgment of the Supreme Pontiff; to do what he commands, and to refrain from that which he forbids; and, lest by chance she should act in contradiction to her own conscience, she would be bound to believe that to be good which he commands, that to be evil which he forbids."[7] We have there, in a still more definite form, St. Ignatius Loyola's famous precept about Black and White: a precept which Tyrrell's ecclesiastical superiors pressed so hard upon him, in the days when he was trying to avoid a breach, that it drew forth his manly protest: " Though God and Reason demand that I should often believe that to be white which seems black to me, yet never am I asked to believe that what seems black to me yet *seems* white to me."[8]

These things have a very definite bearing upon all Roman apologetics, and especially upon what I may call the persuasive apologetics, the pleasant assurances which we get from writers of engaging personality and style, yet lacking in official authority; assurances which are conveniently allowed to pass uncontradicted by the higher authorities. Natural as is the assumption that Bishops, whose main duty is to guard their flocks from false or dangerous doctrines, approve in their hearts of all that they permit to be said, there could be no assumption more dangerous when we are dealing with the Roman Church. If the Archbishop of New York has allowed Governor Smith's *Credo* to pass all this time uncontradicted, this may just conceivably mean that he agrees with it, but it might only mean that silence, for the moment, is politically opportune. We could prove this by innumerable instances; let me give only one here, for the sake of its curious psychological interest.

---

[7] *Disputationes de Controversiis,* Vol. I. Ingoldstadt, 1601. Col. 974. (*De Rom. Pont.* lib. IV. c. 5.)

[8] *Life,* Vol. II., p. 116. See further in Appendix.

In 1921 a book was published in Texas with an effusive commendatory letter from the Bishop of the diocese (San Antonio, in Texas). It was a Life of the Venerable Anthony M. Claret, late Archbishop of Cuba, and Founder of a new Religious Order. Among many miracles attributed to the Venerable Archbishop, one, on p. 40, tells how successfully he lied to the Customs Officers. A poor man was trying to smuggle a sack of contraband tobacco. For the sake of his wife and children, the good priest (for this was in his earlier days) undertook the sack as his own, and declared it as containing lentils. The carabineers, suspicious, opened the sack and inspected the contents; yet, (blinded, of course, by God,) they mistook them for lentils, as declared. "When the priest handed the sack back to the owner, it contained nothing but the tabooed article, tobacco." And this, however surprising morally, was, from the purely physical or mechanical standpoint, one of the least remarkable of the Archbishop's many miracles, in life and in death. In 1890, Leo XIII. issued the preliminary decree for his beatification; Pius X. showed equal benevolence, and there is every prospect of his canonisation in due course.[9] To draw too logical a conclusion from the episcopal favour to these immoral stories, and from archiepiscopal silence in the face of it, would be as dangerous as to assume that Governor Smith's reassuring assertions are correct because the authorities let them pass.

[9] For full text and vouchers, see Appendix.

And, if the folly of this Claret story, and of the whole book, staggers the unprejudiced reader, let him look at the chapter which Salmon devotes to the silence, (and often the benevolent silence) of the Holy See in the face of equal extravagances; or, again, at two little books by a writer who signs himself Paul Parfait; *La Foire aux Reliques* and *L'Arsenal de la Dévotion.* The reader who follows the story of St. Simon Stock, and his two little pieces of flannel which are warranted, on the authority of the Virgin Mary and eight Popes, to guarantee from hell anyone who dies piously with them upon his person, may well doubt whether he is standing on his head or his heels.[10] These follies, which run unhindered for centuries, cannot be altogether ignored by the thinking public; if at any moment they became politically opportune, they would be appealed to as genuine Catholic tradition. It was through ideas of this kind, despised at first by the most educated Catholics, but taking root quietly in the crevices until they had become ineradicable, that the Infallibility Decree of 1870 became possible.

Since these lines were written, British eyes have been to a certain extent opened by the Malta episode. Here, again, a distinguished layman was put up to throw dust in our eyes—Prof. de Zulueta of Oxford—and *The Times* even lent itself, to some extent, to the deception. Facts which he has not dared to contradict may be found in my pamphlet *Malta—and Beyond* (Simpkin Marshall, Ltd., 6d.).

[10] *L'Arsenal de la Dévotion*, pp. 114 ff.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ROMAN INDEX.

How can these things really be? This same psychological question crops up elsewhere: How can a man live a double life, as we know that a good many have done and still do? The Roman Church, as an institution, lives a double life.

Really able Romanists, if born in the Church, make the best of their mother; Governor Smith, with his total ignorance of the *Syllabus,* is a typical honest and devout Catholic from childhood. If, on the other hand, they are converts, they generally knew nothing of these things when they went over. In either case, the *intelligentsia* ignore them now as much as possible; and (what is equally to the point) the multitude for whom St. Simon Stock's scapular was invented, or who find edification in Claret's pious lie, ignore the *intelligentsia* of their own Church. There is a system of watertight compartments, made possible by the prohibition of free speech. Some men hold their tongues through fear; others in contempt. When Dr. Rifaux compiled his *Conditions du Retour au Catholicisme* from the signed contributions of twenty-nine eminent Catholics and one anonymous friend, two others to whom he applied frankly refused to publish their real thoughts. One, " an eminent priest, author of highly esteemed historical works," wrote that by thus speaking out he would probably earn the same condemnation as some of his ablest contemporaries, and " when once I had been branded like them, all that I undertook would be suspected and blighted. " Another, " a bishop, whose piety, orthodoxy, and attachment to the Church can be doubted by nobody," wrote: " You must clearly understand that Bishops are the least free of all men;

and that, if they are unlucky enough to have ideas of their own, they must think under their breath and feel a holy horror of ink and of printing." Again, from "an ecclesiastic whose works are in the hands of every educated seminarist and priest" we have: "I should have been happy to bring my modest contribution to the enquiry which you have organised. But the diocesan authorities, to whom I am bound to submit all my writings before publication, would only pass a work of this kind after corrections and suppressions which would distort them and rob them of all interest." Again, "a Religious, to whose collaboration we attach a high price on account of the authority he enjoys among clergy and laity," writes: "I beg you will believe my good will; but it is bound by the authorities, who grudge their approval more than ever. At the present moment, I am under orders to keep silence, under pretext of rest from my fatigues." Another, "whose name is universally known and valued among Catholics": "This *questionnaire* is terrible. . . . Is it good to say all that one thinks on that matter? Yes, if the remedies we suggested had the least chance of acceptance by those who alone could effectively administer them. . . . Perhaps, after all, it is best that the truth should not be told by our own folk." Rifaux concludes: "I could extend these quotations beyond measure; my portfolios are stuffed with similar confidences; but they all show the same state of mind. . . . When consciences are so enslaved that they no longer dare to make use of their liberty, then we should vainly attempt to dissimulate the gravity of the crisis under which they are suffering."[1] Pernot, again, gives similar testimony. He writes: "As Mumbauer has put it expressively (*Allgemeine Rundschau*, Aug. 24th, 1907), in the midst of modern life, [the R.C. hierarchy] rebuilds the Ghetto, and shuts the Catholics up in it. Wherever they can, they create special Universities or Faculties, to keep the studious youth away from public institutions, and to remove them from the action of official science, with its progress and its methods. Catholics are put into a group of their own, whether in politics or in literature or in finance. And this masterpiece is complete: modern life as a whole, in all its manifestations, is purged of the Catholic element; the Catholics, of their own accord, render themselves incapable of exercising any influence over their own epoch. Science is pursued without them; without them, social life goes on its way of progress. They have become the useless members of civilised society."[2]

---

[1] *Les Conditions*, pp. 7—10.

This is, after all, only a plainer statement of what Tyrrell quotes from Newman's letter to Miss Bowles in 1866: "Instead of being a world-wide power, we are shrinking into ourselves, narrowing the lines of communion, trembling at freedom of thought, and using the language of dismay and despair at the prospect before us, instead of, with the high spirit of the warrior, going out conquering and to conquer."[3] The Decree of 1870, so far from mending this difficulty of 1866, made it worse: Rome drifted still further from the real world; and Pius X. widened the breach with his Encyclical *Pascendi;* it has been called "a rupture of diplomatic relations between Rome and modern thought." Houtin, therefore, sums up on p. 82 of his *Crise:* "The young priest, on that day when he took those oaths which pledged him for the whole of his life, thought he was devoting himself to the preaching of the truth; whereas he was entering into a caste which has always fought against knowledge [*la science*] and has imposed errors and impostures which are supposed to be pious. . . . For those who might judge this verdict too hard, I add that I think I have given proofs for it in my previous books—stories which have not been refuted." Therefore, let us now look more closely at that Censorship system which forms the wall and the gate of this Romanist Ghetto.

---

[2] Pernot, p. 144.

[3] Tyrrell, Vol. II., p. 338; Ward's *Newman,* Vol. II., p. 127.

Tyrrell found another word for it, "The Prison"; a prison, as he pointed out, none the less real because men sometimes walk into it of their own accord and then throw away the key.[4]

We have seen how fatally the mediæval Church was warped by her literal insistence on the doctrines of Exclusive Truth and Exclusive Salvation; *extra Ecclesiam nulla salus.* It compelled her to kill books wholesale, whether by birth-prevention or by child-murder, and to kill human beings to an extent which has often been numerically exaggerated, but which in fact needs no such exaggeration; a single bonfire, human nature being what it is, may be all that is needed, over a wide district and a whole generation, *pour encourager les autres.* The doctrine of *no salvation outside* has, of course, been gradually watered down; from grim earnest it sometimes approaches now to Gilbertian comedy. Rome chants *never, never can be saved,* and humanity protests, *What, never?* and Rome readily condescends: *Well, hardly ever!* Yet these concessions in detail and in practice, forced upon the Church by a business world which sees certain facts too clearly to be imposed upon by the mediæval *never, never,* have led to no retractation of that fundamental and impossible theory. In theory, there is still no Salvation outside Romanism; and Romanism alone has the Truth; and the modern spirit is kept quiet only by the most illogical compromises. The spirit of Rome is unchanged; let me repeat here once more that I speak of official Rome, as distinguished from the millions of quiet Catholics who, like other quiet religious folk, are justified not by their outward label but by their inward attitude towards God. These men have nothing to be ashamed of; but, when the Roman Court speaks with her traditional haughtiness, it is necessary to remind her of her own past. Mr. Belloc, and Father Knox, when they insist that Roman pretensions "infuriate" Protestants, mistake the mood altogether. Our real feeling—I speak as a man who looks upon *Protestant* as a very honourable name—is one of curiosity, sometimes mingled with admiration, but more often with a certain contempt. To express it, I must borrow the words of a modern Catholic who sees a great deal to mend in Romanism, and whom I can quote only from memory; he compares the contemptuous Pharisaism of some of his fellow-orthodox to "le regard méprisant d'une vieille cocotte qui offre le pain bénit aux filles-mères de sa paroisse." Not only heretics in the Middle Ages, but orthodox Catholics then and since, have described the Court of Rome (as apart from the real Catholic faith) by that plain Latin word which French slang renders by *cocotte.* And, though every year makes her older, fundamentally she is no less *cocotte;* fundamentally, she is unrepentant, at the back of the pinchbeck logic and the witticisms with which her minor apologists try to distract public attention. Father Ronald Knox has complained that we outsiders, according as it suits our convenience, accuse the Roman Church at one moment of being too logical, and at another of being illogical. That is not true; the fact is, that we complain *always* of the same thing; we complain of her *simultaneous* logic and lack of logic; we complain of that curious combination of incompatibles which is nowhere so happily exemplified as in Father Knox's own speeches and writings. In one sentence he is ferociously logical; we tax our brains to follow his philosophy and see whither it would lead; but the next sentence shows that we are dealing in effect with the philosophy of Father O'Flynn, determined that "the clargy should be Oirishmen too." What carries all this off, what makes outsiders respect it even while they smile, is the great redeeming fact that these men do often help the lame dog over the stile. But, at bottom, that has nothing to do with their boast of logic; and meanwhile, behind and above Father Knox, the Pope and his Court are mumbling under their breath the same intransigent doctrine which, in the days when they enjoyed real power, they used to proclaim aloud to Emperors and nations: the doctrine that all outside Rome is error, and error has no rights. This it is which moves outsiders to that feeling which the professional Roman controversialists flatter themselves by describing as "fury." But fury is far from our real mood. A certain "advanced" clergyman is said to have held forth at great length before a diocesan synod, and to have ended with, "I am afraid, my Lord, you look upon me as a terrible black sheep." The Bishop is said to have replied, "Sheep, Mr. Blank, is not the animal we are all reminded of."

---

[4] This simile has been appropriated and ingeniously inverted by Mr. Chesterton; with what verisimilitude, anyone may judge who reads his booklet, *The Superstitions of the Sceptic* (Heffer, 1925).

We have seen how Melchior Cano, in the mid sixteenth century, was distressed at the working of censorship in his own Church. Yet that system still continues, and still works as badly as it did four centuries ago. Censors have forgotten nothing, and learned nothing. For they have an irresistible compelling force behind them: they are driven on by this theory of Exclusive Truth. In that field, Romanism can certainly plead logic for all its most autocratic acts; its only logical lapse is when it makes any allowance whatever; it would be more consistent if it treated printing as an invention of the devil. The true Romanist might judge the British Museum, *mutatis mutandis,* as Khalif Omar is said to have judged the Alexandrian Library, the marvel of the ancient world. "If all these books contain what is in the Koran, they are superfluous. If they contain what is not in the Koran, they are mischievous. Burn them all." John of Salisbury records the tradition that St. Gregory the Great, for similar reasons, did actually burn the Palatine Library; the story is in all probability false, but as a mere tradition it is significant; it is *ben trovato.* We owe a great deal of mediæval literature to the fortunate victory of practical common sense over logic. The logical position is that which Pius IX. stated in his Vatican Decrees. "If any man say that the faithful and those who have not yet arrived at the Uniquely True Faith, are in like condition, so that Catholics might have just cause to call in doubt that faith which they have already received under the teaching of the Church, and to suspend their assent until they have arrived at a scientific demonstration of the credibility and truth of their faith, let him be accursed."[5] The moment any man treats a Romanist dogma in his own mind as doubtful, the moment he seriously suspends his assent in the hope of arriving at the truth by scientific demonstration, he ceases to be a Romanist; he is accursed.[6] Yet what is scientific demonstration, but the result towards which we struggle in all serious matters? the result which we aim at through the patient weighing of all evidence, from whatever source, and the balancing of all factors against each other without fear or favour? in short, the kind of demonstration we aim at when we are choosing a bank for our money or a doctor for our family? Yet that process lies under the Roman ban; the Pope, in St. Peter's name, curses St. Paul's warning that we should prove all things, and hold fast to that which is good. Compare, again, Leo XIII's *Letter to the Prelates and Clergy of France* (8th Sept., 1899) exhorting them to study history; yet "those who study it must never lose sight of the fact that it contains a collection [*un ensemble*] of dogmatic facts, which impose themselves upon our faith, and which nobody is ever permitted to call in doubt"—*révoquer en doute,* a phrase which includes not only public doubting, but private doubting, if only for one moment.[7] The plea that Romanists, in thus submitting, follow the reasonable example of other folk who take directions from specialists, is absurd. For reasonable folk are careful not only to choose their specialist, but also to check his advice in so far as they can; and the only specialist in medicine who proclaims "Choose me; all the rest are ignorant; you can follow me safely, but you follow the rest at your serious peril!" is the practitioner of the market-place.

---

[5] *Conc. Vat.* sess. III. can. iii. § 6; for Latin text, see Appendix.

[6] Aquinas, *Sum. Theol.* 2a 2æ, X. 7; cf. Cardinal Lépicier, *De Stabilitate et Progressu Dogmatis,* 2nd Ed. 1910, p. 217.

I have said, we try to check our specialist *as far as we can.* Our limitations of thought and knowledge are very narrow, and the wisest people are most conscious of these limitations. Every man, again, must here judge for himself; must mark the point at which, for himself, further enquiry would be more likely to end in muddle; and at that point to stop. It is a familiar experience with microscope or telescope; the eye can strain no further, and at that point we cease to strain. At that point, true Catholicism finds its full justification; a man has a right to subordinate intellect to intuition, if his conscience assures him that such subordination, in his own case, will bring him nearer to the truth. But, if this justifies the convinced Catholic, it justifies also the convinced Protestant, and it does not justify the Romanist. For Romanism not only bases its theory on an empire over the intellect; it has also in practice exercised an agelong tyranny over the intellect; and, in so far as it deprecates scientific examination, it betrays the tyrant's fundamental cowardice.[8]

Mr. Chesterton, in a letter to me explaining that he would need ample space for any discussion of Infallibility, pleaded that "we really do believe that we have the larger and more many-sided philosophy, containing but reconciling apparent difficulties: and, unless that is explained, we feel as Einstein might feel if somebody played to the gallery by saying he talked nonsense about crooked straight lines." This is a strange standpoint to take. Are we indeed to believe, nowadays, that the things which to Rome have seemed so obvious during the last thousand years, are really to be grasped by no more folk than those who can grasp Relativity? Have so many people been legitimately burned, and so many millions been threatened with the rack and the stake, for not holding a theory that is scarcely comprehensible to one man in a thousand?[9] But let us accept Mr. Chesterton's assumptions (which is always the most profitable course with him) and proceed to see how they work out. He, and other Romanists as learned as he, stand above me in philosophy as Einstein stands above me in physics. When I fail to understand them, it is for me an apposite and chastening reflection to remember that I don't understand Einstein either. Yet I believe in Einstein as I do not in Mr. Chesterton; and I think I can justify this distinction by common sense. Einstein's physical theory, in the main, commands the assent of practically every living physicist, including large numbers who were extremely sceptical or hostile until an eclipse enabled it to be tested by actual observation. Mr. Chesterton's philosophy is rejected by, I suppose, at least ninety per cent of philosophers, including some who had been brought up in it, and who, in casting it away, cast half their heart with it. A general history of all philosophy during the last hundred years would contain the names of comparatively few Romanists, and perhaps none in the first class. Again, whereas the real Einstein challenges the most searching criticism, and most of his warmest supporters would welcome any clear and convincing disproof of his theory, the Roman Einstein curses free enquiry, and thinks it better to reign over an acquiescent crowd than to serve under a higher truth. Logically, it is strange that the man who claims to possess most of the truth, yet who can command least adhesion from specialists, should deliberately avoid the most natural method for gaining or retaining any adherent worth having—that is, frank interchange of thought. Yet this logical puzzle is a psychological commonplace; the bully is very often a coward. And, the less we agree with Mr. Chesterton's belief that true Catholicism is as abstruse as Relativity, the more right we have to criticise Roman censorship. If Christ's gospel was in fact a message for simple humanity, it certainly ought not to need to be bolstered up by the most violently protective measures that have ever been devised—if we except the long-defunct Revolutionary "Committee of Public Safety," and the passing phrase (as it may be hoped) of the Bolshevik State.

---

[7] Printed by C. Mirbt, *Quellen. z. Gesch. d. Papsttums,* 2nd Ed., p. 414.

[8] Fr. Knox, in his *Belief of Catholics,* pp. 42ff, is extremely misleading. If (for instance), St. Thomas Aquinas had exercised his intellect with absolute freedom upon the discussion of the orthodox eschatology of his day, he would only be known to us now as a brilliant heretic, burned perhaps side by side with his own books.

---

[9] Fr. Knox seems here to differ widely from Mr. Chesterton; to him, the problem is in no way comparable to Relativity: "I am not certain that I should not have become a [Roman] Catholic earlier, if [Roman] Catholicism were not so glaringly obvious." (*Spir. Aeneid,* p. 57.) This seems to be the same conviction which justified Aquinas in his theory of punishment for heresy. But with Fr. Knox, as with Mr. Chesterton, one must be cautious in all attempts to fix the exact meaning of what they print. They are probably most amused by those readers who take them most seriously.

The very theory of Romanist censorship is a confession of weakness; the strongest states and the truest creeds can always afford to tolerate most criticism.[10] The Romanist Censor dares not openly to declare disbelief in Christ's word, "the truth shall make you free." He believes, but he trembles. And here, as elsewhere, fear often begets clumsy cruelty. I have already quoted (p. 111) from that pathetic letter which will be found complete in Vol. I., p. 159; the painfully orthodox German scholar of about 1750, who had scrupulously kept the prescriptions of the Index, but who found them, for himself at least, practically prohibitive of all real scholarship. Definitely as this poor man was able to plead his services to the great Cardinal Baronius, there is, I believe, no evidence whether he got even the limited licence for three years which he requested.

---

[10] I have reviewed the new edition of the Index in the *Nineteenth Century and After* for March, 1930. The book is almost incredible in its old-world stupidity; and English Romanists are heartily ashamed of this republication.

Yet now, just as this book goes to press, the present Pope has issued another edition, somewhere about the hundredth, of the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*:[11] it is a tragi-comedy that a Pope who certainly has a conscience, and who earned a special reputation for learning, as custodian of a great library, should give his authority to this antediluvian document.[12] Some of the worst absurdities, it is true, have disappeared. It is possible now to read Galileo and Kepler and Copernicus without endangering our salvation. Erasmus' works, from the first to the last, are no longer condemned; nor is Dante's *De Monarchia*, nor one of the most important writings of the Blessed Robert Bellarmine, who is now in process of canonisation. Yet Montaigne's *Essais* may not be read by any faithful subject of the Pope,[13] nor may the majority of the greatest philosophers of the last three centuries or more. The names of great Frenchmen are so frequent on this list that, if the Pope could have his way, he would reduce the faithful of that nation to a people of dunces. Even Taine's *History of English Literature* may not be read, nor that encyclopædia which probably stands for reference in every important editor's cabinet or printing-house, Larousse's *Grand Dictionnaire Universel.* The English list is almost equally comic. Richardson is forbidden, but not Fielding, nor Sterne's *Tristram Shandy.* Here is, in itself a sufficient answer to the suggestion that the Index may be specially concerned with morals; but this is further emphasised by the fact that Machiavelli and Rabelais and Boccaccio are now forgiven by the censorship—except, of course, in so far as the faithful are warned against immoral books in general. Boccaccio has a most interesting history; there is at least one authorised edition which renders him innocent for pious Romanists by changing the clerical sinners into lay sinners, while the sins and indecencies themselves remain unaltered. A copy of this is easily accessible in the British Museum, marked by its former possessor to show the alterations. To return for a moment to Britain; even this latest Index still forbids works, and often the principal works, of Bacon, Sir Thomas Browne, Gibbon, Lord Acton, Locke, Andrew Lang, J. S. Mill, Hobbes, and Berkeley. The ancient Erasmus Darwin's *Zoonomia* is forbidden by name, but not the modern Charles Darwin or Herbert Spencer or Huxley. The most orthodox reader could not fail to be struck by the random methods of this solemn Index; and indeed the writer of a recent and most edifying book unconsciously betrays the general feeling in his communion. Mr. Brodrick, in his *Life of Blessed Robert Bellarmine* (1928, Vol. I., p. 276) has to deal with his hero's condemnation. He speaks of the Pope's hasty temper and the bitterness of Bellarmine's critics, and adds: "with counsellors such as the eminent man who wrote this letter at his elbow, *it is little wonder* that Pope Sixtus let his personal prejudices have their way. Bellarmine was put on the Index; and all that Aquaviva and the Cardinals could obtain from the impetuous Pontiff was a brief respite before the condemnation was officially promulgated." The Pope, as it happened, died almost immediately afterwards, and his successor reversed the condemnation. But the words which I have italicised tell their own tale. If it was so natural for a Pope's personal prejudices to outweigh the fact that Bellarmine was one of the greatest controversial champions the Roman Church has ever had—perhaps the very greatest—and the further fact that nearly all the condemned book was vehemently Roman, and fell short only in so far as it did not grant the Pope the plenitude of power as an earthly sovereign, supreme over kings, then the system stands self-condemned. That which should be a matter of the most deliberate and reasonable judgment becomes a mere chronicle of caprice. Mr. Brodrick's defence reinforces, in effect, the impression which we get from a perusal of the names recorded on this Index, and comparing them with the names omitted.

---

[11] I return to an almost incredible mis-statement, to which this book commits itself, in Chapter XVI. here below.

[12] I dealt with this in *The Nineteenth Century and After* (March, 1929). A second edition has since appeared, with the mis-statements uncorrected.

[13] Except for more or less furtive allowances, which I shall presently deal with. The Index, like the Volstead Act, has given birth to a system of bootlegging.

The only thing that mitigates all this absurdity is the fact, especially notorious in English-speaking countries, that not one Romanist in a hundred cares ever to look into the Index, or would obey it if he did. It is in vain that the present edition, like Leo XIII's before it, naturally condemns translations of the condemned books,[14] and insists that all its prohibitions must hold throughout the world, " except in cases of real necessity, wherein the Holy See is wont to dispense " (pp. xiii., xvi.). Here we have one of the most solemn of Romanist documents, and one of those most characteristic of the whole Romanist tradition. Therefore, like the Infallibility Decree, it exemplifies the hollowness and impotence of mere Romanism wherever we can separate it, for purposes of observation, from the Catholicism to which it is parasitically attached.[15] A correspondent sends me, of his own accord, his own experiences of twelve years in the Jesuit Order. He points out that, within recent years, the Jesuit *Month* has contained articles on Montaigne's *Essais* and the *Religio Medici,* calculated to attract readers to both those books. He adds: "I myself never knew that they were forbidden; and I am quite sure that my superiors had not the faintest idea of it"; and again: "It is difficult to see how any conscientious Roman Catholic can take any sort of post in a modern printing or publishing concern, or work in a public library; for nearly all such concerns print or distribute forbidden books." And he directs attention to one page of the preface, which inculcates the traditional methods of Romanist discipline—espionage and tale-bearing. It is laid on the conscience of every true son of the Church to inform against any book that he considers objectionable; and Canon Law guarantees him that his name will be kept secret. When we remember that no reason is ever given on the Index for the condemnation of any particular book, that the victim has seldom a fair chance of explanation, and that the damnatory sentence is peremptory and irreversible by any other tribunal, we may understand the indignation which my correspondent expresses at this "stabbing in the back." The methods of the Censorship, as apart from its principle, have extorted protests even from so irreproachable a Catholic scholar as Abbé Boudinhon, who writes: "It is to be regretted that the catalogue [in Leo XIII's edition] does not discriminate among the prohibited works according to the motive of their condemnation and the danger ascribed to reading them. The tendency of the practice among Catholics at large is to reduce these condemnations to the proportions of the moral law."[16]

---

[14] e.g. it is sinful to read any of the many English translations of Maeterlinck.

[15] A Swiss bishop pointed this out at the Vatican Council. " What boots it to condemn errors that have been long condemned, and tempt no Catholic? The best defence of Catholicism is religious science." (Acton, *Hist. of Freedom*, p. 533.)

But, to most plain-thinking people, there seems serious danger in a system of elaborate and peremptory legislation which subjects are compelled to "reduce to the proportions of the moral law." Why not reduce the enactments to moral proportions before they are promulgated at all from Rome? Who, again, is to perform this delicate process? Who is competent to bring Papal Decrees into conformity with ordinary morality? Does not the system invite caprice and prejudice, each man "moralising" this imperfectly-moralised Index according to his own convenience? I have heard a Continental Romanist scholar plead, by way of apology, that in Catholic France, during the eighteenth century, speculations were sometimes printed so startling in their modernity that they could not have been published in the Protestant Britain of that day. That is true, and it would have been even more undeniable if he had added that there was in France a similar freedom for obscenities also. But the argument may be reduced to its proper proportions by restating it in terms of present-day experience. In America, under the despotic Volstead Act, it is often possible to get liquor at times and in places at which our more tolerant British laws, and our British police, would make it far more difficult. In both these cases, is it not true that the most serious reasons for doubting the wisdom of the law are to be found in its habitual violation?

---

[16] *Encyc. Britannica,* Vol. XIV., p. 375 (11th edition). This defect is remedied very imperfectly in the present edition of the Index.

Nobody has brought this out more clearly than certain Liberal Catholics (including, as he now permits me to say, Dr. E. J. Dillon) under different *noms de guerre,* in *The Contemporary Review.* They have emphasised the enormous gulf between what may be written or spoken among English-speaking or German Catholics, and the frequent petty restrictions in the Latin countries, where clericalism holds stricter sway. Let us hear what "Voces Catholicae" have to say in Vol. LXVI. (1894) pp. 351ff.[17] "Thus, the English

---

[17] Cf. Oct., 1897 ("Romanus"); May, 1899, pp. 629ff, lamely answered July, 1899, pp. 87ff. For another important extract, see my Appendix here.

Jesuits unhesitatingly endorse certain views of mine which their Italian *confrères*—unaware of the line that would be followed in this country—not only contradict but ridicule. On the other hand, when the Italian members of the Pope's bodyguard solemnly warn all Catholics that certain of my statements 'set truth at defiance and do violence to the sacred texts,' their English brethren actually fall into the trap set for the 'blasphemer' and proclaim my view to be correct." Later, when Leo XIII. published his new Index, the *Contemporary* came to the charge again, and was answered at great length in Cardinal Vaughan's quasi-official organ, *The Tablet;* long extracts from both may be found in Mr. Putnam's book on the Index (Vol. II.). "Romanus" writes in the *Contemporary* (Dec., 1897, p. 861): "The old Index was never supposed to be binding on English Catholics, and, indeed, its provisions were such that it was practically almost a dead letter on the Continent also. It was intended that the Vatican Council should reform it, but for such matters there was no time. It has now, quite recently, been withdrawn, and a less unreasonable law substituted for it. At the same time, however, the new Index was formally declared to be applicable to all countries. Much to the annoyance of the English Catholic bishops, its text was published in English in *The Tablet* and *Weekly Register*. Great was the distress which arose in a multitude of worthy, but timid and scrupulous minds from this publication, and great was the trouble brought upon the bishops by shoals of letters begging for guidance and advice. Very quickly the bishops began to instruct their clergy to be quite silent about the Index whenever possible, and when too much pressed about it, to give the most indulgent replies to those who would not go unanswered. This, however, was not enough. Pressure was brought to bear upon Rome, which was forced at last to learn something of the condition of affairs in England, and finally, supreme authority has had to draw in its horns and suffer it to be spread about in England that the new reformed Index does not apply here, and that in this happy country every condemned publication can be read, and any work on morals or religion published and circulated, without ecclesiastics having power to prevent it."

To this the apologist replies (Putnam, p. 423): "Probably out of every hundred Englishmen or Americans who rail against the restrictions of the Index, not a tithe has any direct acquaintance with, or takes any due account of, the flood of bitterly anti-Christian literature, often infidel, immoral and blasphemous, and almost always insidiously polemical, which is poured over Italy and the Continent generally, by the masonic and anti-clerical press. It is in great measure this degrading abuse of one of the noblest faculties of civilised society, and the need of duly protecting the minds of the masses, that the provisions of the Index are specially designed to meet. . . . No one who looks upon the face of Christendom to-day can fail to note that there exists a clearly marked difference between the whole set of social and political circumstances which obtain in the English-speaking lands and those which obtain in the various countries of the Continent. . . . In English-speaking countries there does not exist upon any large or popular scale such bitter and active propaganda against Christianity and Christian morality as are unhappily at work abroad, nor is there that widespread prevalence of aggressively anti-Christian and pornographic literature which the infidel and anti-clerical press pours forth like a pestilential sewer in certain continental countries. The Church has wisely taken into account the special character and circumstances of Catholics in the English-speaking countries, and the significance which as expressing the more modern development of social and political life they promise to possess in the future. For centuries the provisions of the Index in their more rigid sense have not been practically applied to these countries, and to a very large measure these provisions have been left in abeyance with the perfect knowledge of the Supreme Authority. . . . The Constitution published by the Holy See, in January last, was naturally issued to the Church at large, and when it appeared in the Catholic press of England it necessarily elicited from both clergy and laity the question whether this new Constitution was or was not intended to supplant the *status quo* which had hitherto existed among us. The reply to the enquiry addressed to Rome by the Cardinal, Archbishop and Bishops of England, conceded the most ample powers for dispensation, so that, owing to the 'special circumstances of the country,' the bishops in England were fully authorised 'to modify the rigour of the law by their prudence and council according as the case might demand.' Rome's reply was thus as ready and as liberal as could well be desired. . . . " In other words, English-speaking countries have hitherto been free from that plague of clerical and anti-clerical conflict which has infected every land in which Romanism has been the dominant sect! The one apparent exception, Ireland, falls in really with the rule; for in Ireland the priests have ruled with a despotism which has often revolted even the faithful; O'Connell, for instance, who proclaimed publicly that he would take his theology from Rome, but not his politics.[18] In Ireland, therefore, as in Spain and France and Italy and Belgium and South America, Papalist and anti-Papalist often work each other up to a frenzy of hate.

But, though this bootlegging in English-speaking countries does so much to nullify the real law of the Index, and shows up its absurdity in face of the purblind mediævalism which still prohibits Montaigne's *Essais* and the *Religio Medici* and Bacon's *Advancement of Learning,* yet this Index and its attendant censorship are fatal to real freedom. They are like a clog on the pasturing horse; he may seem to move freely enough while he browses with his nose to the earth; but, the moment he tries to run freely with his fellows, his slavery becomes apparent; he is citizen of a servile state. It is in vain that the Roman apologist takes pains to assure us to the contrary; for we have not only common sense, but explicit and irrefragable testimony from within, against him.

---

[18] Salmon, p. 464.

Mr. Leacock, in one of his most amusing essays, describes his experiences with a medium. One great man after another is evoked—Napoleon, Lincoln, and so on—and each, speaking through the medium, begins with the same stereotyped assurance: "Oh! if only you knew what it is like to be here!" Mr. Leacock hoped for a little variety in these revelations from a higher world; but he hoped in vain. There is a certain kind of uniformity which fails to carry conviction; and many outsiders feel, what the pious Romanist Duggan has confessed, that there is something seriously deceptive in this exterior unanimity of his own Church.[19] Not that we need suspect personal insincerity; in the nature of the case, those who actually come forward to testify are a select few; and Messrs. Belloc and Chesterton and Knox (to name only three prominent champions of the moment) may mean every word they say, yet convey a distorted impression of the whole system. It is a question of different idiosyncrasies and varying proportions. Nobody can study the Roman Church without realising how great an institution it is in many directions, and how much scope it can afford to any soul that happens to be in pre-established harmony with those particular directions. But not all of us are born to such pre-established harmony; nor are we likely to find what some of these writers have found. There is no reason to question the substantial accuracy of their description of their own feelings on this point. For some minds, even though no such doctrines as the Roman had existed, it would have been necessary to invent them. And a great many others can play about within certain definite limitations, without feeling the pinch of those limitations by personal experience. A bluebottle fly impresses us with perfect content and enjoyment in the freedom of an inn parlour. He runs up and down the window like a spark in the chimney; he threads an infinity of airy mazes round our head; he takes advantage of our baldness, but that adds piquancy to his sport; and we reflect that whatever seem least reasonable in his evolutions may, after all, be providentially ordained. Even in an inn parlour, the bluebottle is among the most wonderful of God's creatures. Yet there are other flies who feel the irresistible need of open air and wider space, and who would far rather take the risk of a predatory swallow than of the spider's web and the slimy flytrap that crowns the parlour ceiling.

---

[19] *Steps towards Reunion,* p. 196.

Therefore, writers more distinguished than the three above-mentioned have sometimes given very different evidence; some, in confidence to their intimate friends; others, in revolt against intellectual and spiritual restraints which had at last become intolerable.

Newman, the greatest original thinker whom English-speaking Romanism has produced, felt himself a slave in the hands of the Papal Congregation which watches most definitely over doctrine. He wrote to a friend, in 1863, " I think I am right in saying that the Acts of Propaganda are the Pope's in an intimate manner,—a privilege which the other Sacred Congregations do not share. It gives great weight to the words of the Bishop of Birmingham, that the substance of them has the direct sanction of the Holy See. Nor have I any difficulty in receiving them as such. . . . I will tell you what seems to me to be the real grievance. . . . Now what do the Bishops do? All courts are superseded because the whole English-speaking Catholic population all over the world is under Propaganda, an arbitrary, military power. Propaganda is our only Court of Appeal; but to it the Bishops go, and secure it and commit it, before they move one step in the matter which calls for interference. And how is Propaganda to know anything about an English controversy, since it talks Italian? by extempore translation (I do not speak at random) or the *ex parte* assertion of some narrow-minded Bishop, though he may be saintly too. And who is Propaganda? Virtually, one sharp man of business, who works day and night, and despatches his work quick off, to the East and the West; a high dignitary indeed, perhaps an Archbishop, but after all little more than a clerk, or (according to his name) a Secretary, and two or three clerks under him. In this age at least, *Quantula sapientia regimur!* Well, if all this could be said of any human institution, I should feel very indignant, but it is the very sense and certainty I have of the Church being divine, which at once makes it easy to bear. And this will be over-ruled; it may lead to much temporary mischief, but it will be over-ruled. . . . Meanwhile, it is a grave consideration, that in England, as things are, upon theological questions the Pope and the individual Catholic meet each other face to face, without media, in collision, without the safeguard of springs and cushions, with a jar; and the quasi-military power of Propaganda has the jurisdiction and the control of the intellect."[20] Newman, it is true, imagined that mediæval thinkers had enjoyed more freedom of thought; and in this there is some truth, though Newman exaggerates enormously. But that his complaints of present servitude were not exaggerated, we have abundant evidence. In another letter he points out how imminent is the danger of his being called to go and explain himself in Rome, if the Bishop chooses to complain against him; how Dr. Baines had, in fact, for similar reasons, been kept at the door of Propaganda for a whole year, cut off from friends, in a foreign city with foreign faces and manners and beds and food, and uncertain of his final fate; to some (adds

[20] Ward's *Life*, Vol. I., p. 559.

Newman) this has meant death. Lucas had gone to justify himself at Rome, but the Irish Archbishop Cullen was against him. " He wandered (as Dr.Cullen said in a letter he published in a sort of triumph) from Church to Church without a friend, and hardly got an audience from the Pope; and he came home to die. And then again: if I, as a private priest, put anything into print, Propaganda answers me at once. How can I fight with such a chain on my arm? It is like the Persians driven to fight under the lash. There was true private judgment in the mediæval schools; there are no schools now, no private judgment, (in the religious sense of the phrase), no freedom, that is, of opinion. That is, no exercise of the intellect." To be taken to Rome, and there to die, " is the prospect which I cannot but feel probable, did I say anything which one Bishop in England chose to speak against and report. Others have been killed before me."[21]

Yet the Roman world has been even more definitely subject to Propaganda since 1870 and Pius X.; and Newman, if he were still alive, would have still more occasion to repeat Oxenstierna's complaint: " With how little wisdom are we governed! " Catholic Congresses are much advertised nowadays; but their freedom of discussion, as I know by experience, is very limited. As Houtin says, " Catholic Congresses have been under strict surveillance; and there is every reason to believe that they will never enjoy the liberty which, after all, is necessary for any meeting which calls itself ' scientific.' "[22] Let us again borrow Mr. Chesterton's comparison, and ask ourselves what decent folk would think if, at any meeting of the British Association, there were men ready to report at once to Einstein that speakers were flatly contradicting him, and to silence the audacious contradictors.

As to the methods of the Censor proper, we have the evidence of many modern writers who have had ample experience. Mr. Joseph Mc Cabe (who in the Franciscan Order was Father Antony, Superior of the Convent at Forest Gate) writes: "The manner in which they exercise their usurped responsibility is trying to the patience of the ordinary layman. The priest, especially the friar, has very little acquaintance with fiction, still less with science or philosophy, and very wrong ideas of history; and, since the majority of condemned books are not 'nominatim' on the Index, but simply involved in the general censure of, 'against faith or morals,' he has to exercise a judgment of an unusually delicate character. The result is confusion and tyranny. One priest is delighted with *The Three Musketeers* and permits Dumas—sweetly oblivious of the fact that Dumas is on the Index 'nominatim.' Ouida is much disputed—even amongst the Jesuits; the pure and high principled works of George Eliot are condemned unheard—she was an Agnostic and lived with Lewes; Marie Corelli is dangerous, anti-sacerdotal, so are Mrs. Grand, Rider Haggard, Thomas Hardy, etc., etc.; indeed, the poor Catholic is perplexed before the list of modern novelists. So it is with science and philosophy; the best English and German exponents are heterodox, and when a priest pays his visit and sees their works lying about, he not infrequently demands that they be destroyed."[23] Again, let us hear Count v. Hoensbroech, in his autobiography (*Fourteen Years a Jesuit,* Vol. II., p. 267): "The [Jesuit] Order knows no mercy when the scholarly achievements of members do not fit into its own framework of learning. Then the censorship and punishment do their worst. In the years 1890 and 1891 I was myself book-censor *(censor librorum)* for the German Province, a position which may testify to my reputation for learning in the Order. I am, therefore, exactly informed of the methods of Jesuit censorship. When the interest of the Order is opposed, not the smallest regard is paid to personal freedom, nor to the established results of scientific investigation or individual ability. The censorship deletes and the author submits; the punitive authority punishes and the culprit remains dumb. In the last year of my theological studies one of my fellow-scholastics, a man of superior gifts, who was specially interested in natural science, the Jesuit Breitung, wrote an article for the Jesuit organ *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* (published at Innsbruck) about the Deluge. Breitung maintained the ethnographic universality of the flood, i.e. that all persons then in the world perished except Noah and his family, but in accordance with the results of geological and palæontological research, he abandoned its geographic universality, i.e. he admitted that not the whole earth, but only the whole of the inhabited earth was flooded. The article had passed the Provincial censorship, but found no favour at Rome with the head censor of the Order; it was a 'new doctrine subversive of the Scriptures.' (Galileo's teaching was also 'new and subversive of the Scriptures.') The General Anderledy issued a decree which condemned the theory of the geographical limitation of the Deluge. When Breitung had ended his studies he was not allowed to devote himself to natural science, as had been universally expected on account of his special gifts and preliminary studies, but was appointed teacher in the lowest classes in the College of Ordropshoj in Denmark. There he was 'harmless.' What scientific work he now carries on I do not know. A few years later the Belgian Jesuit Hahn, Professor of Natural Science at the College of Arlon, had published a book on the Spanish Saint Teresa à Jesu, and had come to the conclusion that some remarkable phenomena in the life of this nun, which had hitherto been regarded as miraculous and tokens of divine grace, were of a hysterical character. His book had actually been 'crowned' by a Spanish Catholic academy. But Rome here again thought differently. The book was censored, and the Order removed its author from his scientific professorship. One of the most celebrated theologians of the Order at the present day is the Jesuit Domenico Palmieri. He, too, came into conflict with the censorship in his theological researches—I forget what was the point in question, certainly not one which was established dogmatically, i.e., 'infallibly' by the highest ecclesiastical teaching authority—and in consequence had to resign his chair."

---

[21] Ward's *Life*, pp. 586, 588, printed more fully in Appendix.
[22] *Crise*, p. 75.

---

[23] *Twelve Years,* p. 171.

Finally, let us see the verdict of a Jesuit who had been even longer in the Order than Count v. Hoensbroech. Mr. Barrett writes (*The Jesuit Enigma,* p. 230): "Unless [a Jesuit author] makes these changes [demanded by his censors] his book may not be published. He may entirely disagree with the views thus foisted upon him, but he has no alternative but to submit. . . . A Jesuit scientist, therefore, can never freely publish his real opinions on scientific questions. He cannot deliver himself of the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. He has to play the rôle of co-operating in a subtle form of deception, or else bury himself for ever in silence." Mr. Barrett gives his own personal experiences in this matter on pp. 332—3.

CHAPTER X.

THE IRON HEEL.

It will be seen, then, that nothing but the most desperate controversial needs can prompt Roman apologists to assert that there is real freedom of thought within their Church; except, of course, for those who think so little, or whose thoughts are so happily coincident with the thoughts of the Roman Court, as to make conflict impossible. There is a freedom as of bats in the dark, or as of a whippet intent only upon his master's handkerchief, who could run safely on a narrow straight track between two precipices. But a Romanist, so long as he is obedient, is living as Tyrrell describes him, in a prison which is no less a prison if he has locked himself up in it and thrown away the key. He may plead that stone walls do not a prison make; the charm of the divine Anthea may make him feel as free as any man, but that is only in so far as he is a Catholic, not as a Romanist. Men have every right to plead, as Mr. Chesterton does, and as Mr. Summerfield Baldwin pleads in the *Atlantic Monthly*, that " it is the house of the Beloved, it is a house of rest." But, as Mr. Baldwin confesses, elective affinities blow whither they list; one man's Beloved is to some other man a slut or a virago; and Mr. Baldwin himself, in the very same breath, has told us that the House of the Beloved is at the same time " a place of suffering, a house of bondage." " Love me, love my Pope " is not an argument of universal cogency; and with many honest, thoughtful men the intoxication has passed away, the scent of love has grown stale, the bondage has become more obvious and more galling from day to day. Fortunate are those who see this in time, and who seek their decree of nullity before a whole family of children is born, thus making the bondage as irremediable as it is intolerable!

"The effect of the Index has often been described in the epigram 'non-Catholic books are condemned, and Catholic books are not read—*Acatholica damnantur, catholica non leguntur.*'"[1] "What made Catholicism impossible to [Renan] was the irreconcilable opposition which, he believed, existed between it and criticism."[2] When the Bishop of Langres demanded from Loisy obedience to those decrees of Pius X. which even the most docile among educated men cannot accept nowadays without a strong pinch of salt, the Abbé replied: "My mind would no more be able to live in the intellectual atmosphere of the decree *Lamentabili* and the encyclical *Pascendi,* than my lungs could breathe at the bottom of the sea. This full and entire submission, of which Mgr. Merry del Val speaks, could be nothing but a lie on my part; and, instead of being a meritorious sacrifice, as your Lordship calls it, this would be, for me, a senseless gesture contrary to all morality."[3] "The Roman Index," writes Abbé de Meissas, "forbids all books which might lead to the light, or might at least put us on the way to it. And the Index is for the priest as it is for the rank and file of the faithful. It even counts for more in his case; because the priest, by reason of his mental state, is almost the only man who will take seriously the penalties decreed against the transgressors of the Index's prohibitions."[4] Even W. G. Ward —to whom Newman was but a lukewarm Catholic, and who said with pious exaggeration that he worked with Manning for the Infallibility Decree in the hope that it would daily bring him some fresh Infallible Definition from Rome, with the *Times* on his breakfast table—even Ward had admitted, in 1857, that the censors sometimes blundered badly. "I suppose a line of philosophical thought which is substantially true and most important may find its way into the Index for a time. The Cardinal says that the being put on the Index is not a fact which in any way calls for interior assent as to the falsehood of what is condemned, but only external submission and silence."[5]

---

[1] Pernot, p. 148.

[2] Fawkes, p. 52.

[3] *Quelques Lettres,* p. 250.

[4] *Crise,* p. 303.

Indeed, in the face of the censors' blunders, your true apologist is very little embarrassed. "They explain to us how the Holy Office of the Inquisition does not blunder even when it blunders, and how it can say Yes and No on the same subject, yet be always in the right. At first sight this seems difficult; but don't be deceived; the question shall be cleared up by the Reverend Father Choupin, S.J. He writes: 'If indeed, after a fresh examination of the question, light becomes clearer and more complete; if, in short, by reason of the progress of science these reasons are judged to be serious and conclusive, then the Holy Office, without contradicting itself, without contradicting its first decree, may declare, by a fresh decision, that this proposition is not erroneous, etc. In fact, there is no opposition between these two sentences, viz.:

> (1.) Given the present state of science, and the circumstances, it is prudent and sure to look upon this proposition as erroneous and contrary to Holy Scripture; or
>
> (2.) Given the present state of science, it is not imprudent, it is sure, to look upon this same proposition as well-founded, and conformable with Holy Scripture.

'The circumstances have changed; you understand that there are two different and successive judgments, each of which is legitimate in its own day.'[6] Mark well this method. The Holy Office has condemned a proposition as erroneous. Now, it happens that this proposition is proved, and that the Holy Office was wrong. In rush the theologians, and say, 'Ah! pardon, *erroneous* meant *in the present state of science.*' If that were so, why could you not have said so? And, next, what qualifications have the members of the Holy Office for deciding *the present state of science?* What honest man can fail to see that all this stuff exudes insincerity at every pore? And yet, it is this same Holy Office to which these same theologians would compel us to give our inward adhesion!"[7]

---

[5] Ward's *Newman*, Vol. I., p. 420.

Tyrrell had every reason to know how the censorship system works; and this is how he describes it in his farewell letter to the General of the Jesuits: "The clerical education to-day at Rome is in substance the same as it was in the sixteenth century; it considers men Doctors of Theology who know literally nothing of Biblical criticism, of patrology, of history, ecclesiastical and profane, of any *living* subject whatsoever; whose sole equipment is the scholasticism of St. Thomas. It would be indeed strange or even miraculous, if such men had an intelligible answer to questions whose very terms they had studiously made themselves incapable of understanding. And yet your Paternity implies some such miraculous enlightenment when you propose to me the judgment of these ecclesiastical officials as claiming, not merely outward practical obedience (which within due limits every Catholic must allow) but also inward speculative assent grounded on the words of Christ: *Qui vos audit me audit*—'He that heareth you heareth Me.' As for the 'grave displeasure' of Pope Leo XIII., and his almost 'incredible' utterances about me, which your Paternity dare not trust to paper, I should be more impressed had I the slightest reason to suppose that his Holiness had ever read a line of my writings or troubled himself to ascertain my meaning. The days have gone by when Rome refused to condemn a man unheard. . . . Strive how I will, I cannot bring myself to believe that when authorities almost ostentatiously despise the natural means of arriving at a just judgment, when their every utterance is fresh proof of their mental incompetence, when there is not the slightest reason for supposing them to be the recipients of miraculous guidance, that then in 'hearing them I am hearing God.' Let us have done with this uncritical exegesis once and for all. . . . Neither in the government of the Apostles by Christ, nor in that of the Church by the Apostles, is there the slightest trace of that dominating, autocratic, arbitrary rule which the text in question is so often adduced to justify. This dictatorial regimen was imported from the State into the Church in a military age, when no other conception of government was possible, and before men were ripe for the liberty written broad over the face of the

---

[6] *Valeur des Décisions Doctrinales et Disciplinaires du St. Siège,* 1907, p. 60. The author refers to Cardinal Billot as his authority, and adds that the Cardinal "applies exactly these principles to the case of Galileo." Yet we have seen that in that case the "changed circumstances" have been far less in science, than in theology. Galileo's science was comprehensible to thinking men of his own day; it has become more and more comprehensible to thinking men, and there could never have been any objection to it but that the Holy Office declared it contrary to an inerrant Bible, as interpreted by that autocratic Church which claims absolute monopoly of interpretation. What has reconciled Galileo to the modern Roman Church is, that the modern Roman Church no longer dares to stand by its seventeenth century interpretation of "Thou hast made the round world so fast that it cannot be moved." And when we say *Church* here, we may say *Pope* also, since even Choupin admits the cogency of Abbé Vacandard's proof that "it was certainly in the name of the Pope, and therefore of the Teaching Church, that the judgments of 1616 and 1633 [against Galileo] were pronounced" (p. 141: where Choupin declines to contradict Vacandard's contention that "the Holy Office and the Index acted only under the Pope's orders; they were only instruments in the hands of Paul V. and Urban VIII.").

[7] *Ce que,* p. 295.

Gospel. If Churchmen still cling to it after the age has abandoned it, they must expect to be cut off more and more from the general life and to be regarded as a *gens lucifuga,* wedded to principles subversive of the existing basis of social order and progress."[8]

Doctor Rifaux, in his well-meant apology, enables us to measure the terrible distance between Catholic hopes and Papal facts. He gives a long list to prove the compatibility of orthodoxy with scholarship and science. He writes : " Eminent critics like Mgr. Mignot, Archbishop of Albi, Abbé Loisy, Abbé Turmel, Père Lagrange, Abbé Vacandard, Mgr. Batiffol, Pères Ermoni and Rose, Abbés Jacquier, Tixeront, etc., though differing in temperament, do not hesitate to face straightforwardly the most delicate questions of the Old and New Testament, proving thus, by their very example, that Catholic faith has nothing to fear from the investigations of the most scrupulous science. Historians such as Mgr. Duchesne, J. Guiraud, G. Goyau, Baudrillart, Thureau-Dangin, Chénon, Allard, Kraus, Hemmer, Funck, Kurth, etc., have sensibly raised the level of scholarship in Church history, inspiring themselves with modern scientific methods, in spite of the spirit of conventionality [*esprit de système*] which hitherto reigned so shamelessly among us. Catholic philosophers like Ollé-Laprune, Blondel, Fonsegrise, Laberthonnière, Dunan, Bazaillas, Ruyssen, Leclère, Abbés Denis and Piat, Mgr. Mercier, Sertillanges, etc., are among the élite of modern thinkers. Writers such as Brunetière, Melchior de Vogüé, Victor Giraud, Felix Klein, Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, P. Viollet, etc.; scientists like Grasset de Montpellier, Vicomte d'Adhémar, Duhem, Lapparent, Branly, Arcelin, etc., put their great intellectual value at the service of Catholicism."[9]

This was written in 1905; let us read it in the light of subsequent events. " Mgr. Mignot, Archbishop of

---

[8] *Life,* Vol. II., p. 465.

[9] *Agonie,* p. 288.

Albi, has not ventured to reprint his letters to his clergy in a volume, for fear lest the book should be put on the Index."[10] Baron von Hügel possessed fifty letters from him, which, as the *Church Times* reviewer points out, will probably be suppressed in the interests of Rome.[11] Loisy is excommunicate; Turmel lived to see his books fill nearly half a page of the Index; Batiffol had one condemned; both made laudable submissions in 1911.[12] Vacandard, for his honesty, saw scores of far inferior men put over his head; he died quite recently in a comparatively obscure position. Duchesne, the greatest of these historians on the list, saw his masterpiece put on the Index. Kraus, perhaps his nearest rival, escaped the same fate only by a series of subterfuges, writing under different pseudonyms. To those who might be inclined to accept Allard as a leader of historical science, I may be permitted to suggest that they should verify the corrections I had to make on pp. 496ff of my *Mediæval Village.* Laberthonnière and Sertillanges both arrived at the honours of the Index. Brunetière, though not named, was so definitely rebuked by Pius X. in *Pascendi* that it broke his heart. Viollet's most important book was put on the Index because he ventured to interpret the *Syllabus* just as Governor Smith and Father Duffy would like to interpret it. As to the scientists, I wonder what effect these names would have on scientific students, in comparison with the mass of scientists who have no use whatever for Romanism. It must be remembered that, to readers of *The Universe* and *The Catholic Times,* Mr. Belloc seems a scientist. Von Hügel, who had some claim to that name, and was a real religious philosopher, escaped condemnation mainly because it was far more profitable to make use of him so long as he kept within tolerable bounds;

---

[10] *Crise,* p. 166, written in 1907.

[11] June 3rd, 1927; review of Bernard Holland's edition of F. von Hügel's letters.

[12] *Mod. Cath.,* p. 401., cf. 203. For Turmel see p. 153.

for here was a convinced Catholic of high social position, able to hold his own in intellectual circles, and penetrated with deep religious feeling.[13]

Ermoni's case was most significant of all. In Rifaux's plea of 1905, he figures among the proofs that Catholicism can produce learned and intelligent Biblical scholars. In 1909, he dared to defend his fellows against the Encyclical *Pascendi,* as men who, at least, had good intentions. Houtin tells the rest of his story.[14] "Perhaps M. Ermoni expected a future swing back of the pendulum. Meanwhile he himself fell in the fight. He was expelled, for the boldness of his ideas, from the Lazarist Order, which he had joined in his misunderstanding youth; he would not join the parochial ministry, and, therefore, he resolved to go on studying at Paris, rather than preach doctrines which he did not believe. The fees from Masses and from the few articles which he managed to get printed paid for his modest lodging, but he suffered long from hunger. Since he had got it into his head that he would never quit the cassock, but would celebrate the Sacraments till his death, he resigned himself to destitution. At the beginning of 1910, an ecclesiastical publisher who had gone to give him some work found him sick, alone in his room. He told the Superior General of the Lazarists, who answered that M. Ermoni had ceased some years ago to belong to the Society, which could do nothing for him. He was taken to the Catholic hospital of St. Joseph, where he soon died from the effects of his privations."

Some others have similarly held out, but, naturally, very few. In 1898, Abbé Harrent wrote a book on *The Schools of Antioch in the Fourth Century.* His bishop demanded that a copy should be sent for examination by the censor. He replied, "I wrote my book with all the sincerity and loyalty of my mind; I am not one of those who write history to order, and who are ready to falsify it in order to save what they call their 'principles.' My studies are not apologetical, they are only sincere. I wrote what I believed to be the truth; I have nothing to cut out or to modify." He resigned his curacy and left the Church.[15] But the ordinary attitude is that of Abbé Bremond, who, like Viollet and Laberthonnière and many others before him, quietly submits.[16] Where the clergy are specially powerful, as in Canada, the abuse of authority is naturally great; very striking instances are given by R. de Marmande in his *Cléricalisme au Canada,* pp. 96, 130, 134, 140, 188—90.

---

[13] See Appendix.

[14] *Mod. Cath.,* p. 263.

Wilfrid Ward, in 1893, supplied a similar moral in the light of subsequent events. In order to show that modern Romanist scholarship had nothing to fear from its adversaries, he insisted on "the growth since the Vatican Council of a school of Ultramontane critics, Biblical and historical, whose accuracy and eminence are beyond dispute."[17] He gave five names, among which were Duchesne and Loisy. To the latter he gave a special testimonial for "acquaintance with the true critical method . . . candour and thoroughness." The words remain unchanged in the reprint, though by that time the Index had tried to silence Duchesne in his strongest field, and had driven Loisy out of the Church.

Döllinger had pointed out, very truly, how the Decree of 1870 had been made possible by the fact that, gradually, every attempt to test the theory of Infallibility by historical criticism had been put on the Index and suppressed, excepting only those of Bossuet and Cardinal de la Luzerne.[18] Hasenclever, again, was one of the learned Germans who refused submission to the Decree: "What particularly scandalised him was the sudden condemnation, by placing on the Index [of] books which have been for a considerable period accepted authorities within the Church."[19] The tyranny is such, that men will condemn a book or a doctrine, or allow it to be condemned, merely to save their own skins. "In 1906 (June 27th) the Papal Biblical Commission solemnly declared the arguments 'amassed' by critics (as it said) against the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch to be insufficient. Now it is certain that, among the consultations of the Commission, the most learned and the best-known in the scientific world by their work were either not consulted or voted against this; their published works prove this. . . . All theologians agree in deciding that the decisions of the Papal Biblical Commission, even when approved by the Pope, do not enjoy the privilege of infallibility; but, then, how could reasonable men contract, in any way whatsoever, a real conscientious obligation to hold the truth of eventual decisions which they know may be false?"[20]

---

[15] *Crise,* p. 320.

[16] See Appendix.

[17] *W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival.* Re-issue (1912), p. 426.

[18] Sparrow-Simpson, p. 206.

I have said, "such is the tyranny"; for no other word will paint the true situation. The Encyclical *Pascendi,* and the anti-modernist oath which was its sequel, naturally led to a sort of Reign of Terror; but things have been bad enough at all times for the independent thinker. The Roman Church maintains, more than any other society outside Bolshevism, the principle of espionage and delation. In the Middle Ages, scholars at school and university often held their scholarships on condition of talebearing against their fellows. Talebearing was the very foundation of monastic discipline; and it reigns nowadays in Seminaries and in Romanist schools, on the Continent at least, to an extent which would be felt impossible in any other institution. Mr. McCabe bears testimony to this in his *Twelve Years in a Monastery,* pp. 64, 156. Newman's sufferings from spies and talebearers are well known; they come out clearly enough from his own letters. His contemporary, Ozanam, one of the real literary glories of Catholicism, described the difficulties he had had in founding his Société de St. Vincent-de-Paul. "It met mistrust everywhere. If, at Lyons, it did not fall under the blame of the Church authorities, if a few venerable priests even encouraged it, it has never ceased to be a butt for the vexations of many lay folk, . . . who modestly take our Lord's place, and say, 'He who is not with us is against us.' You could never believe the meannesses, the quibbles, the artifices which these people, with the best faith in the world, have employed against us. After all, we must not pity ourselves, when we have to do with a world in which M. Lacordaire is anathematised, M. de Ravignan pronounced unintelligible, and Abbé Coeur a suspect."[21] Tyrrell, writing to the General of his Order, laid stress on this abuse and on the tyranny which enforced it. "The circumstances which have led the Society to substitute, for a personal, a military government extending to the subject's will and judgment, and to base this absolutism on the divinity of the Superior's will and judgment, have produced (as e.g. in Russia) the most unqualified despotisms that it has ever yet entered into the heart of man to devise, the worst and most profoundly immoral forms of government that the world has yet known. For the essence of all vice and immorality is the destruction of spiritual liberty. From this fundamental corruption—the insensible result of inevitable circumstances—derive nearly all those other features of the Society's government which offend one's moral sense." Again: "A more unpleasant adjunct of this 'protective method,' which runs through your whole system of education spiritual and secular, is the use of espionage, of secret delation and other inquisitorial tactics in the interests of government. One looks for this in Free-Masonry and secret societies; or in a despotism like modern Russia or mediæval Spain; but not in the *Schola Christi.* To be 'visited' at prayer and other spiritual duties, to have one's correspondence (incoming and outgoing) inspected; to be informed on by others, all struck me, when a novice, as singularly discordant with the freedom of God's service. But I was told that we consented to these infringements of personal liberty by a personal act of renunciation, which therefore covered them all with a new cloak of liberty; that we did so as a protection against ourselves, as when a man fetters his limbs and throws away the key. Plausible as this sounds, yet is the 'protective' principle any better because it is applied to us suicidally by our own act? Is our power of will and of self-determination weakened or strengthened by such procedure? Does the one free act of renunciation do for us what the continual exercise of self-government would have done? But unfortunately these 'vigilance' methods are too convenient and necessary to the weakness of absolute government not to be quickly perverted from its alleged use to that of an instrument of government. How completely the Society is governed to-day by these secret methods your Paternity knows better than I can tell you. I can hardly conceive any institution more profoundly immoral than that of the *Syndicus;* the secret informer who reports the sayings and doings of the community to the Rector, or of the Rector to the Provincial, etc. The result of this government by secret delation could only be what it actually is—a profound mutual mistrust among the members; a feeling of insecurity and isolation; a general friendlessness and lack of affection."[22]

---

[19] Sparrow-Simpson, p. 323.

[20] *Ce que,* pp. 252—3.

---

[21] *Ce que*, p. 437.

All this is completely corroborated by Mr. Barrett, himself an ex-Jesuit, who gives quotations from distinguished and orthodox Catholics which show how notorious the Jesuit Order has been, from the very first, for its reliance upon espionage and talebearing

[22] *Life,* Vol. II., pp. 480, 491.

as the very foundations of discipline. The whole of his fifth chapter is devoted to this subject: "It is put before [the Novices] as a holy and salutary religious practice. . . . They readily agree to the system without understanding what it entails." The system has sometimes been pushed to such extremes as almost to amount to a direct breach of the Seal of Confession. But human nature will often revolt against even the most tyrannous rules, and at the Jesuit school in Ireland where Mr. Barrett learned and taught, Clongowes, there were "some 'decent men' among the masters, Jesuits who would not spy, whom we admired and trusted, and for this reason the irritation caused by spying did not banish kindly relations between boys and the community. But the system had undoubtedly an evil effect on the boys' training. Spying suggests distrust, and being distrusted awakens the worst latent tendencies of character."

One of the most shameless examples of this tale-bearing system was disclosed when the French Government, under extreme provocation, seized and published the papers of Mgr. Montagnini, a parasite employed to work in Paris and report to the Pope's Secretary of State, Cardinal Merry del Val. The story may be found, with others, in chapter seven of *Ce qu'on a fait de l'Église,* which is devoted to this subject of espionage and backbiting. Among other things, the papers proved that the Cardinal himself had lied; it may perhaps be pleaded that these were not the lies of a churchman, but only of a politician. Politician undoubtedly he was; we find him writing to Montagnini: "Take care to listen a great deal, report everything to me, and speak little." Montagnini received, in addition to his working expenses, a thousand francs per month. "The cream of the story is that this money was taken from Peter's Pence, the 'Apostolic halfpenny,' raised in France; so that Cardinal Merry del Val had the pious delicacy to pay the spy from the purse of the men on whom he was spying.

We should have been glad to know what Pius X. thinks of all this; but what we do know is this, that many pious Catholics feel the blood run to their cheeks. . . . Naturally, when all was discovered, virtuous indignation was feigned at Rome, and they threatened the French Government with publication of the whole *dossier;* why did they not publish it? If the French Government has splashed about in the filth, let public opinion sweep it away! Let everything be told. But, until this is done, we shall be justified in thinking that these threats are only one lie more, and a bold attempt to mislead public opinion. As a matter of fact, Montagnini has been neither blamed [by the Pope] nor disavowed. If a priest is brought, by his studies, to new views about the date or authorship of certain books of the Bible, the authorities wield their thunderbolt, condemn, suspend, excommunicate; but when the very representative of those authorities practises, year after year, methods of espionage and talebearing which would provoke the contempt of our school-boys, all that seems normal and legitimate." The time covered by these papers was one of deep distress for French religion; the Separation Laws, the expulsion of the monks and nuns, the closing of religious schools and impoverishment of religious societies. " But what was the universal stupefaction when it was discovered that, in the daily reports from Montagnini to the Secretary of State of the Holy See, there was never once a single word about the churches, the works of charity, or the poor country clergy, humble and deserving as they were. On the other hand, this Italian prelate denounced, at random, almost all men in the French Church who were capable of writing and thinking; and what had most interest of all for the Holy See and its representative was, whether M. Piou [another parasite] should stand for election [as deputy in one constituency or another]. A very active correspondence was exchanged on that subject." " Yes, those were the good days! [when Pius X. had proclaimed the duty of talebearing]. Under that impulse from on high, priests denounced their bishops, and lay folk denounced their priests. Monks and nuns worked covertly against the prelates who received them into their dioceses; and the superiors of Grand Seminaries betrayed the diocesan bishop who honoured them with their confidence."[23]

Leo XIII. was a Pope of some real learning and liberality; yet here is an anecdote told by an admiring biographer concerning his treatment of one of the most distinguished Catholic scholars in France. "We have already noticed the marked preference and deep admiration, amounting almost to adoration, expressed by Leo XIII. for the Angelic Doctor, and it is interesting to observe how the Pope's energetic efforts have brought his clergy throughout the world to share his views on the matter. Mgr. d'Hulst, who was accused, wrongly as it turned out, of having taught a philosophy other than that of St. Thomas Aquinas, at the Catholic Institute in Paris, was obliged to go all the way to Rome and produce the copy-books to convince the Pope that the charge was unfounded."[24]

But the worst pressure came with Pius X's Encyclical *Pascendi.* A contemporary Catholic, groaning under this régime, spoke out plainly. "Meanwhile the mysticism of Pius X., the sectarianism of Cardinal Merry del Val, the selfish pushfulness [*l'arrivisme*] of Mgr. Benigni, elements so strangely combined for providential purposes which God knows and which we know not, weigh upon the Church of France as a veritable Reign of Terror. Secret accusations are everywhere. At ecclesiastical dinners, the guests examine each other, so to speak, before they allow themselves any liberty of criticism, for fear of spies, who are better hidden under the cassock than, in certain salons, the police spy is hidden under a well-cut coat. The Archbishop of Paris dares not to authorise a religious celebration for the centenary of Montalembert; or (what is worse) he authorises it only on condition that we pray men to be kind enough to join the organisation committee who are the incarnation of just those ideas which Montalembert diametrically opposed."[25]

---

[23] *l.c.,* p. 455, with references to the actual documents.

[24] *Pope Leo XIII.,* by Julien de Narfon. London, 1899, p. 201. The word here rendered *copy-books* by the English translator is of course *cahiers,* i.e., the lecturer's own MS. of his lectures.

For further evidence as to the censorship system and its effects, see *Crise,* pp. 36, 41, 75, 78, 82, 155, 160, 166, 320; Sparrow Simpson, pp. 183, 198, 206, 211, 264, 285, 313, 316; Loisy, *Autour,* pp. x., xi., xiv., xix.; Houtin, *Priest's Life,* chapter 22; and two whole chapters in *Ce qu'on a fait de l'Eglise,* pp. 354ff and 434ff; see also the case of M. Turmel on p. 260. The Lyons group put the story in a nutshell (*Ce que,* p. 338). The Pope protects his flock just as Molière's quack protects the father against his daughter's too unanswerable pleas: "I cannot make her mute; but I can make you deaf." Let us remind ourselves of the Diocesan's remark to Houtin: "A Bishop does not discuss, he condemns."

P.S.—Since this chapter was written, Turmel has been excommunicated by name, and all faithful Romanists are forbidden to have any dealings with him.

---

[25] Julien de Narfon, *Séparation,* p. 312.

CHAPTER XI.

THE PRIEST'S EDUCATION.

THIS censorship system is poisonous. It was the worst curse of the Tsarist régime, and it is one of the darkest blots on modern Bolshevism. It is only partly redeemed by aiming, in theory, at an ideal so much less materialistic than the Bolshevik ideal; for it worked disastrously even in the thirteenth century, when men (rightly or wrongly) reckon the mediæval Church to have been at her best.[1] Perhaps it is more definitely redeemed by the fortunate fact that it is no longer backed up by such an overwhelming superiority of physical force as enabled it to operate almost unchecked in the Middle Ages. While censorship of this kind numbs the pupil, it has a scarcely less stupefying effect upon the master. It ignores the mysterious writings of the spirit in individual minds; by its encouragement of formalism and of the dead letter, it hypnotises itself into a worship of outward show. This was one of Newman's worst trials, when he came to compare the Church in which he found himself with the Church that he had hoped to find. He wrote to a friend in 1863, after eighteen years of experience: " The only thing, of course, which it is worth producing, is *fruit,*—but with the Cardinal [Wiseman] immediate show is fruit and conversions the sole fruit. At Propaganda, conversions, and nothing else, are the proof of doing anything. Everywhere with Catholics, to make converts, is doing something; and not to make them is 'doing nothing.' And, further still, in the estimate of Propaganda, of the Cardinal, and of Catholics generally, they must be splendid conversions of great men, noble men, learned men, not simply of the poor. . . . And Catholics in England from their very blindness cannot see that they are blind. To aim then at improving the condition, the status, of the Catholic body, by a careful survey of their argumentative basis, of their position relatively to the philosophy and the character of the day, by giving them juster views, by enlarging and refining their minds, in one word, by education is (in their view) more than a superfluity or a hobby, it is an insult. . . . I should wish to attempt to meet the great infidel, etc., questions of the day, but both Propaganda and the Episcopate, doing nothing themselves, look with extreme jealousy on anyone who attempts it." The failure of his scheme for a Roman Catholic College at Oxford is well known. Rome killed it; such an education as Newman dreamed of was incompatible with the whole Roman Tradition. What the hierarchy wants, is supplied more exactly by the Jesuits than by any other body; and what have they done?

---

[1] I have given evidence for this in a volume on *The Inquisition,* in Benn's sixpenny series.

For many generations, the Jesuits enjoyed unexampled influence over the schools of Austria and Bavaria. Reports of the results, from unimpeachable sources, are quoted by Hoensbroech (Vol. I., pp. 184ff). George Tyrrell, again, in his parting letter to the Minister General, reckoned this matter of education among the worst failures of the Order. He wrote (Vol. II., p. 488): "Is it not notorious that the schoolboys whom you train on these principles and who do not (as so many do, in whose interest the training of all is shaped) pass from the forcing frames of your colleges to the hothouses of your novitiates, but are abruptly thrust forth into the world for whose conditions they are wholly unprepared—is it not notorious that these boys come to grief morally and religiously with a frequency that points unambiguously to a fault in the method of their education? Even the few who turn into good Catholic laymen show their goodness more by a regularity in external observances, and a reverent clericalism that abstains deferentially from all intelligent interest in religion as in an exclusively clerical preserve, than by an energetic participation in the Church's activity. Hence in such a crisis as is now upon the Church in France one looks in vain to the countless Jesuit alumni for any independence and initiative in the hour of need. They have been trained to follow the clergy blindly, to obey passively, not to question or criticise. Can they be expected now to lead, or even to help in an enterprise from which they have been warned off as too sacred for lay hands to meddle with? Yet these are the elect fruits of your college training. But what of the others?"

Hoensbroech and Tyrrell, it is true, were men who had just broken away from the Order; but they write no more strongly than others whose evidence is unimpeachable. Count Montalembert, whose whole political energies were spent on the defence of the Church in France, was just as frank as Tyrrell.[2] He wrote to Père de Ravignan (Nov., 1847): "For the last thirty years your schools have been established in different European countries; for the last thirty or thirty-five you have been educating a considerable proportion of the French youth in especial. Well; you have not yet produced a single defender of the Church. I seek in vain around, among those too rare fighters who have devoted their lives to the Catholic cause; in France and Belgium and England, and, in short, everywhere, they have been formed for the most part elsewhere than by you, and generally against you. . . . . Among the 20,000 Frenchmen who have passed through your hands, we do not even find allies; not even second-rate auxiliaries. We see nothing but flabby and torpid creatures, without energy or courage or generosity, as miserly of time and trouble as of money, for whom the whole of life seems to consist in having children and lands, etc., settled incomes, and in exposing themselves as little as possible." Among Montalembert's strongest political opponents was the Republican, Victor Hugo; but on this particular question of Church education the two were at one. In 1850 (Jan. 15th), Victor Hugo spoke against the clericalist Falloux law of education. He said: "You demand liberty to teach. Come, be sincere, let us understand what this liberty is that you demand: it is the liberty *not* to teach."[3] When Dr. Rifaux, in 1907, collected all those contributions from sincere Catholics who sought to reconcile their Church with thoughtful young men in France, Professor Beudant of Grenoble wrote to him: "The ignorance of Catholics in matters concerning their religion is one of the gravest causes of weakness in French Catholicism. That the uneducated should be ignorant of their religion, as of other things, is sad, but natural and irremediable. That persons who have never got beyond the elementary stage in non-religious knowledge should just know their catechism, and no more, is just sufficient when we reckon strictly; for there is a correspondence between religious and non-religious culture. But that men who have gone through the secondary schools, and even pushed on to higher studies, should not get beyond the level of the catechism in religious knowledge, that seems to me simply monstrous. Yet, as everybody knows, this monstrous thing is the usual thing. It would even be a flagrant exaggeration to say that all Catholics who have a Doctor's degree know their catechism, even if we restricted our consideration to those who have remained practising Catholics. There are men who have risen to the highest regions of profane knowledge, each in his own special field, yet who, in the matter of religious knowledge, have nothing beyond the modest baggage of a scanty primary education, often more than half evaporated. This abnormal ignorance produces sad effects from two points of view. First, Catholics in this condition are unable to contribute to the defence and propagation of their faith. Secondly, it provokes among unbelievers expressions of astonishment and criticism which strike Catholicism herself: a true religion of darkness (say our adversaries) since its practising adherents themselves, even when they are intellectuals, fit to understand and trained to understand, do not even seek to learn its real contents."[4] Dr. Rifaux, who edits this and other contributions to a study of the crisis, lays equal though briefer emphasis on the educational factor (p. 39). "Here we have the main cause of this [present] crisis in Catholic thought. Our intellectual level was so inferior to that of our contemporaries, that nothing short of a miracle from on high could have brought all men's minds into agreement with us. And, without blinking the progress we have made, yet religious teaching, as it is dispensed at the present moment by our ecclesiastical authorities, is still so far below requirements that, (without speaking of the action of [God's] grace), it needs an unusual dose of faith and calmness to avoid, at certain times, yielding to the temptations of doubt."

---

[2] *Ce que*, p. 386.

---

[3] L. K. Goetz, *Der Ultramontanismus als Weltanshauung*, p. 198.

And naturally, in the clerical seminaries, the censorship system is more complete and bears proportionately more bitter fruit. As Professor Beudant writes: "For the last century, candidates for the priesthood have been brought up in hothouses, special enclosed establishments; first the Little Seminary and then the Great Seminary. They live together there, apart from the laity and sheltered from influences supposed to be pernicious. Precious asylums! from which our priests emerge with a special mentality, insufficient information, and eyes enervated by habitual half-light, unable now to face full daylight. . . . That is what we must change as soon as possible."[5]

Döllinger insisted upon this in his open letter of protest against the Infallibility Decree of 1870: "I am further ready to prove that the bishops of the

---

[4] Rifaux, *Conditions,* p. 118.

[5] Rifaux, *Conditions,* p. 116.

Romance countries, Spain, Italy, South America and France, who formed the immense majority at Rome, together with their clergy, had already been misled on the question of Papal authority by the text-books used in their Seminary course, which contain quotations most of which are either falsified or invented. I will prove this in the case of the two principal and favourite text-books in theological schools and seminaries of the present day—Liguori's *Moral Theology* (especially the treatises on the popes), and the *Theology* of the Jesuit Perrone; and then in the case of Archbishop Cardoni's and Bishop Ghilardi's writings, and the works of the Viennese theologian Schwetz, which were distributed in Rome during the Council."[6]

For all this, we have abundant evidence from the autobiographical writings of men who finally found the system intolerable. Tyrrell, in that long farewell letter, laid great emphasis on the hothouse training of a Jesuit, beyond even that of the ordinary Seminary (*Life*, Vol. II., pp. 492—4). It is, in effect, he says, a "press-gang system"; "I can regard the Society as little else than a man-trap, a dangerous snare set for young souls in the early paths of life, resulting in the ruin of their happiness and spiritual health." And he adds (p. 498): "What I have said here is what a hundred Jesuits are saying every day, and what hundreds will be saying in a generation or two. Choose boys as early as you like, blindfold them as tightly as you can, but you cannot prevent the temper and spirit of a free age filtering unconsciously into their minds through what they must eventually read and hear, unless you immure them in solitary cells."

Here, again, is an autobiographical fragment from R. Lecomte, who had been a missionary on the Congo and in the East, and who went over to Protestantism in 1898. "At the age of eight, I was sent as a boarder to a friar's school at which I had not even holidays.

---

[6] Brinckman, p. 114.

At twelve, I was living under the crozier, in the house of a priest who did not allow me to go outside the garden and yard of his presbytery. At thirteen, I was shut up in a Petit Séminaire till twenty. At twenty-one, I was shut up again in the Grand Séminaire, with a cassock on my back. . . . Nothing but prison!"[7]

Houtin, as we have seen, wrote far more fully and explicitly in his autobiography (p. 26): "In reality, the seminary régime is more or less of a disappointment for almost all those who submit to it. But they regard all its imperfections as divinely ordained trials sent them by Providence, and they persevere." What he goes on to say is in consonance with the evidence which we get from other quarters, and with what we can see for ourselves when we find an ordinary priest discoursing upon ordinary topics, or even on strictly religious topics outside his own narrow pastoral groove. The stress which Houtin lays on the hypnotising effect of this concentration upon certain ideas, and this studied ignorance of all that might counter-balance such ideas, is only an exposition from within of what the outsider would at once suspect as a consequence inevitable from this hot-house system. Elsewhere Houtin sums up: "The Seminary selection-system eliminates imprudent or captious characters. Candidates for the priesthood may be presumptuous; but they must conceal it; dissimulation, therefore, is a frequent habit in French Seminaries. Only those boys are kept who seem fit for submission; and the education consists mainly in inculcating intellectual docility."[8] His friend, Abbé de Meissas, writes even more emphatically, if possible, as to the falsehood of the teaching in seminaries, the discouragement of real thought, and the paralysing pressure of the Index.

No doubt seminaries are better than this in England and America, and in those parts of Germany where there is strong non-Romanist competition. We are told, however, that in our own islands the majority of Roman Catholic priests are still imported from Ireland. And, though we meet with men of real culture, these are cultured not in virtue of, but in spite of, the seminary. The censorship-system, the spy-system, the fear of free discussion, are in direct conflict with the best educational traditions not only of this modern world, but also of Greece and of Rome.[9]

---

[7] *Ceux qui*, p. 54.

[8] *Crise*, p. 35; cf. the whole of Appendix I., *La Foi chez les Prêtres*, by de Meissas.

We need not doubt, again, that the English seminaries have improved and are improving; that the last two generations have seen an advance here corresponding to the general advance of education everywhere. But there is no reason to believe that the system is radically reformed, or that the old defects do not subsist in milder forms, since those defects are natural consequences from the very essence of the system. Wilfrid Ward wrote concerning his own father: "In philosophy itself, what was theologically orthodox was in some quarters insisted on as therefore necessarily intellectually convincing. On the evils consequent on this habit in the ecclesiastical seminaries W. G. Ward often spoke with characteristic vehemence from his personal experience at St. Edmund's. 'The whole philosophical fabric which occupies our colleges' he wrote to Newman in 1860, 'is rotten from the floor to the roof. Nay; no one who has not been mixed up practically in a seminary would imagine to how great an extent it *intellectually debauches* the students' minds.'"[10]

Lord Acton, from a very different point of view, saw no less plainly the defects of clerical education. He wrote to a friend, almost at this same moment (Jan., 1861): "What is most wanted is a high standard of education in the clergy, without which we can neither have, except in rare cases, good preachers or men of taste or masters of style, or up to the knowledge, the ignorance and the errors of the day. They will have neither sympathy nor equality with the laity. The example of France is conclusive. No clergy is more zealous, more ascetical, than the better sort of French priests. St. Sulpice educates them for that but not for learning. So they are shut off from the lay world, they influence only the women, and instead of influencing society through the women help to disorganise, by separating the men and women. 'Our wives,' says Michelet, 'have not been educated in the same faith as ourselves, hence decline of marriage in France.' When the French clergy has a great man to show—Gratry, Ravignan, Lacordaire—his social influence is immense. For it is no answer to say that an ignorant clergy is good enough for an ignorant laity. They must be equal not only to lay Catholics, but also to Protestants, both lay and clerical. They must be educated with a view to the clever enemy, not only to the stupid friend. Asceticism by itself is no security without knowledge. It is just as dangerous to faith in educated men, though not highly or sufficiently instructed, as knowledge is by itself. One-sided view of things, ignorance of the world, ignorance of proportion and perspective in things purely religious, ignorance of the borderland where religion touches the outer world of life and ideas. There have been heresies of false asceticism just as there have of false speculation."[11]

---

[9] Compare Newman's words about the seminary system on page 171 here below.

[10] *Life of Newman*, Vol. I., p. 473.

---

[11] *Lord Acton and his Circle,* ed. Gasquet, p. 166.

CHAPTER XII.

CLERICAL IGNORANCE.

HERE again, in proof that a really educated priest gets his culture in spite of the system, we have the confessions of victims themselves, and appeals to notorious fact. Lord Acton's master, Döllinger, drew his experience from what were probably the best of nineteenth century seminaries, those of Germany. Yet Dr. Plummer reports of him that " Dr. Döllinger considered that one of the main sources of the strength of the English Church was the fact that on the whole clergy and laity have the same education. He was entirely opposed to the system of seminaries, i.e. separate schools and colleges for those who are destined for holy orders.[1] 'The system was ordered by the Council of Trent, but until the last thirty or forty years it was but little known in Germany. It has its advantages, but its disadvantages are enormous; and the marked inferiority of the younger clergy, who have been brought up under this system, to the older, who have not, is everywhere admitted. By the seminaries boys and young men are, so to speak, *cheated* into taking holy orders. They are taken from their families before they know anything of the world or their own tastes, and they do not return into the world until the irrevocable step has been taken. They know nothing of women, young or old, and at four and twenty they are in the confessional hearing the confessions of girls and women of all ages, with nothing to guide them but the coarse books of casuistry on which they have been trained in the seminary. With some ill-advised question they reveal evil not dreamed of before, and ruin a young girl's delicacy of mind for ever.' For schools, he was inclined to think that the confessional was almost a necessity; not as being either prevention or cure, but as acting as a check upon grave evils, of which you would otherwise know nothing; or which, if you did know of them, you would be unable to reach."[2] In a famous speech before the great Munich Congress of learned Roman Catholics, of which he was President, seven years before the Vatican Council, Döllinger insisted on the danger of confining education so much to the scholastic philosophy: the mediæval Schoolmen, he pointed out, "could not construct a system corresponding to the harmony and wealth of revealed truth; and without the elements of Biblical criticism and dogmatic history they possessed only one of the eyes of theology."[3] Much is done by the seminaries to discourage or kill education in the widest sense. Houtin quotes from "a timid and sincere apologist, Père Hyacinthe de Valroger." "He wrote (July 5th, 1863): 'In the present deplorable state of our poor Church of France, a priest who wishes to devote himself altogether to the study of ecclesiastical science is a man who has lost caste'"—*un homme déclassé.*[4] We shall see Pernot emphasising the fact that, even among Cardinals, only a minority know anything whatever of either of the two languages of the Bible, Greek or Hebrew.[5] We have seen how Tyrrell wrote most deliberately: "The clerical education to-day at Rome is in substance the same as it was in the sixteenth century; it considers men Doctors of Theology who know literally nothing of Biblical criticism, of patrology, of history, ecclesiastical and profane, of any *living* subject whatsoever; . . . . It would be indeed strange, or even miraculous, if such men had an intelligible answer to questions whose very terms they had studiously made themselves incapable of understanding." These words were addressed to the General of his Order, in circumstances which would have been fatal to Tyrrell if he had committed himself to any demonstrable mis-statement of fact. The more learned laity, whether in France or in England, have few illusions as to the learning of their bishops. I have heard a well-read and thoughtful convert contend that, in the Church in which he now finds himself, it does not matter that the clergy should be ignorant; that it is rather a spiritual advantage to have an ignorant clergy. This contention was evidently common two generations ago; for in 1858 Lord Acton protested: "I am not disposed to accept the paradox about the necessity of ignorance [among the Roman Catholic clergy] in England."[6] And Mr. Fawkes gives an interesting anecdote to the same effect.[7] Discussing the reasons for the average low standard of learning among French bishops, where the Pope's choice is limited by the Concordat, he adds: "Whether things would be better if, as in England, Rome had a free hand may be doubted. 'What sort of men are the Roman Catholic bishops?' an English convert of the last generation, a militant Ultramontane, was asked. 'Morally, highly respectable; intellectually, beneath contempt,' was the answer. The choice of authority falls instinctively on pliant nullities, opportunist under one Pope, frankly obscurantist under another."

---

[1] It is interesting to find that this is dawning upon the authorities. The Dublin *Standard,* an organ of the Roman Catholic Church, summarises a speech of the Bishop of Derry in its issue of Nov. 9th, 1929. " By decrees of the Council of Trent, the Bishops were enjoined to set up separate schools in which their Levites must be trained free from the taint of the world. Now, however, at St. Columba's College, the 'great experiment' of allowing the seminarists to mix with other pupils is producing excellent results. Their young Levites were in no danger of corruption from the pure, good boys of Catholic homes, and they felt the laity were bound to derive advantages from co-education with their young priests."

---

[2] *Expositor,* 1890, Vol. I., p. 431. Compare this with W. G. Ward's contrary opinion as to the danger of a mixed education in *W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival.*

[3] *W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival,* 1912, p. 160.

[4] *Crise,* p. 40.

---

[5] *Pie X.*, p. 224. Cf. Chapter XIV. here below.

[6] *Lord Acton and his Circle*, ed. Gasquet, p. 2.

[7] *Studies in Modernism*, p. 138.

But perhaps the most outspoken evidence comes from a writer who, since leaving the Roman Church, has shown plainly his competence to judge between the pretence and the reality of learning. Mr. Joseph Mc Cabe writes: "A perusal of the scheme of study which has been described would lead to the impression that Roman Catholic priests must be in a highly satisfactory condition of intellectual equipment. No other priesthood has, or ever had, a longer or more systematic course of training. . . . Yet it is generally recognised that the Catholic priesthood, as a body, are not at all remarkable for their attainments and intellectual training. Their system is admirable on paper, but it evidently breaks down somewhere. That this widely felt impression of their inferiority is not a lingering deposit of the ancient prejudice against Rome is clear from the fact that Englishmen notice the inferiority more particularly outside of England—where Catholic priests do not present themselves in the light of schismatic intruders. And it is placed beyond all doubt by the circumstance that the feeling is largely and emphatically shared by Catholic laymen. Influential laymen like Dr. Ward and Dr. Mivart have written forcibly on the subject; and, on reading the correspondence columns of Catholic papers, one finds much eagerness amongst the laity for the 'higher education,' not only of women but of the clergy."[8]

Again he writes (p. 170): "I have been asked by wives or sisters in the confessional to visit men who were understood to be wavering in faith; I referred them to their parish priests, and was answered that they had so low an estimate of their parish priests that they refused to discuss with them. And where they do meet a Catholic who shows an interest in and acquaintance with modern literature, they are suspiciously forward in urging the restrictions imposed by the Index. If they are not prepared to prime themselves with current literature—and a not unintelligent colleague of mine once frankly admitted that he could not read even the pellucid essays of Mr. Huxley—they take care that their flock does not outstrip them. Indeed, I once heard a professor of dogmatic theology contend that even the *Nineteenth Century* is on the Index, and should be forbidden to Catholics; theoretically he was right, yet so curious is the 'economia' of the Church that it was reserved for a Catholic writer to procure it, by his contributions, a place in the distinguished gallery of the condemned. At any rate, a priest who is not studiously inclined finds ample justification for literary tyranny in the elasticity of the Church's policy." As to the Religious Orders, which are supposed to be the most learned, "A few Jesuits, Benedictines and secular priests are the feeble witnesses, in these later days, to the quondam literary activity of the monastic world."[9] So also judges Mr. Barrett, from twenty years' experience within the Jesuit Order. He writes on p. 297: "As regards Jesuits being 'intellectuals,' every well-trained college graduate is able to see through the pose of the average Jesuit, and is able to recognise his limitations in scholarship. Besides, if Jesuits are 'intellectuals,' how is it that the standing of their Universities in this country [the United States] is so low? What is the depth of the scholarship displayed in the *Catholic Encyclopædia,* in the production of which the foremost Jesuits of the world collaborated? What if professors of Yale or Harvard should read the articles therein which touch on the topics that are the object of their special studies and express their opinion of Jesuit learning?" In another passage (pp. 181—2) he quotes complaints from within the Order, in days when their general reputation and influence was greater than today. "We have countless testimonies to this depreciation of scholarship in the Order. . . . In a draft of the ‘Ratio’ we find . . . ‘The Confessors, too, are in trouble and difficulty when they have to hear a confession in Latin and they can scarcely understand the homilies of the fathers and the lessons of the breviary.’ . . . Fr. Streicher, S.J., in his *Diary of an Indian Journey,* speaking of his Spanish brother Jesuits, says: ‘It seems very probable that many of them do not understand the Mass, and certainly not the breviary.’ From my own experience I can add that, although at present things in the Order are not quite so bad in this respect, there are still very many Jesuit fathers whose knowledge of Latin is exceedingly limited, and whose general culture is confined to knowledge of current events as described in the newspapers.” (Compare also p. 292.)

---

[8] *Twelve years in a Monastery,* 1897, p. 90.

---

[9] *Life in a Modern Monastery,* 1898, p. 171.

Therefore, when we outsiders are told that our differences with the Roman Catholics are due mainly to our own ignorance of a lofty and complicated system of theology, it is refreshing to read the verdict of a man who formerly attained to real and acknowledged proficiency within the fold, and can now judge it from outside. Mr. McCabe writes:[10] “The one science which is thought to be cultivated by all priests is moral theology, the basis of casuistry. The Church of Rome only asks of her sacerdotal aspirant a knowledge of Latin, of dogmatic theology, of moral theology, and of ritual. In the majority of cases dogmatic theology is entirely neglected after ordination. I have, on more than one occasion, heard rank heresy, though not of a very obvious kind, preached from Catholic pulpits. Since their dogmatic treatises bristle with utterly useless and trivial disputes, one cannot blame the priests for shelving them at an early date. The moral treatises are said to be necessary for competent work in the confessional, hence the Church binds priests, throughout life, to attend periodical conferences for the discussion of questions of casuistry, and thus hopes to

[10] *Life in a Modern Monastery,* 1898, p. 178.

keep them in constant touch with that interesting science. Most of the monks are under the impression that, if anything is to be studied at all, moral theology must be taken first; but, in point of fact, the majority devote but a small fraction of their time to it. I have heard groups of the secular clergy (*a fortiori,* of monks), including even canons and deans, display a most surprising technical ignorance in discussing casuistic questions, of which they had had formal notice many weeks in advance. And the same must be said with regard to knowledge of Latin. A large number of priests, secular and regular, lose all but the very rudiments of the language in which all their prayers are couched." Mrs. Waterfield (Lina Duff-Gordon) notes the ignorance of Latin which is sometimes found among the priests in Modern Italy.[11]

This, after all, is only the natural survival of mediæval conditions down into our own century, modified by modern civilisation, but clear in their legitimate pedigree from the days of completest Papal supremacy. In the thirteenth century, at the crown of the Middle Ages, the ignorance of the mass of the priesthood was notorious; saints complained of it as bitterly as the heretics did. St. Bonaventura and St. Thomas Aquinas expose in solemn language the same faults which Giraldus Cambrensis pillories in lively satire, and which Roger Bacon alludes to, in passing, as notorious. Indeed, Giraldus's satire is outdone by the cold evidence of episcopal registers; in 1222, among seventeen parishes in the patronage of the Dean and Chapter of Salisbury, five priests were found who could not construe even the first sentence of the first prayer in the Canon of the Mass. The Book of the Knight of La Tour Landry, compiled in Chaucer's day with the help of two priests and two clerks, shows gross ignorance of the Bible. Ockham, writing about A.D. 1330, tells us of priests sufficiently ignorant[12] to preach that the executioners broke Christ's legs; that Bathsheba was Solomon's wife; that St. Paul had been one of the original twelve Apostles (this was "a certain great Canonist"). He generalises most unfavourably; the Disciple asks: "How can it happen that some erroneous assertion of some Pope can be explicitly condemned, and yet preachers or doctors [i.e. university teachers] cannot easily know this?" The Master answers: "This can come to pass through the ignorance of preachers and doctors, and the want of books; for there are many preachers and doctors so ignorant, and so little learned or skilled in Holy Scripture, that they ignore very many truths in Holy Scripture, and know little or nothing of the Church's decisions." And again, he reports critics of his day as complaining that the Glosses on Canon Law were sometimes false to the Bible text, and as explaining this by the fact that "the glossators were by no means learned in Holy Scripture and in philosophical science."[13] As to the laity, he argues from the fact (which he treats as notorious) that "there are many illiterate folk who have never heard the aforesaid words," i.e. "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," and "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not," and that there are many also who have never heard of the inerrancy of the Church.[14] These are only incidental notices; but, a couple of generations earlier, a great Dominican heretic-hunter confessed that the Catholic was distinguished from the heretic by his ignorance of the Bible; he adds: "This I say, by reason of the heretics' diligence in evil and the negligence of Catholics for good; many of them are so negligent for their own and others' salvation that they scarce know their *Pater* or *Creed,* or teach it to their servants."[15]

---

[11] *Home Life in Italy,* p. 226. (Cf. pp. 202—3.)

---

[12] For details, see No. VII. of my *Mediæval Studies* (1st Series, 3rd edition, pp. 108ff).

[13] *Dialogus,* pp. 454, 615, 631, 706, 732.

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 450.

[15] *Anecdotes Historiques d'Etienne de Bourbon,* 1877, p. 308.

When Fr. Knox speaks with respect of the learning of the clergy, it is with characteristic lack of clearness in his own mind, and of frankness towards his readers. (*The Belief of Catholics,* p. 42.) His words would stand the test if they applied to the better priests, and to them only from the professional point of view. For parochial work and what are called "apologetics," the Roman Catholic priest is better trained than men are for some other professions. But the curriculum, under its pretence of breadth, is essentially narrow; and there are many who retain from this early training only enough to carry them on mechanically in after life. Newman, whose Oxford training gave him good opportunities for judging, speaks plainly on this point; the seminary education is professedly narrow; an education which is supernatural need not be liberal; "in the case of most men literature and science, and the habits they create, so far from ensuring these highest of gifts, indispose the mind towards their acquisition." (*Life,* by W. Ward, Vol. I., pp. 513, 516.) In another passage he writes of "what is one of the evil delusions of *many* who are not converts but old Catholics (perhaps of some converts too), that Catholics are on an intellectual and social equality with Protestants. This idea I have ever combated, and been impatient at; and, till we allow that there are greater natural gifts and human works in the Protestant world of England than in the little Catholic flock, we only make ourselves ridiculous and hurt just that influence by which alone we can hope to convert men." (Italics his.)[16] Though Newman might possibly have written a few degrees more hopefully in our present generation, yet nothing has occurred to reverse the verdict altogether. The group that went over with him, and about at that time, has never been equalled since, even approximately. The great Catholic critic, Friedrich von Hügel, speaking of "the social origin and scholarship" of the Anglican clergy, confessed in

---

[16] *Life,* Vol. II., p. 45.

1912: "The conversions to Rome, so numerous and remarkable between 1845 and 1870, have notably diminished in both respects, especially during the last decade."[17] Fathers Martindale and Knox, who were brilliant Oxford scholars, are very notable exceptions. Not one in 1,050 of the adult population go over each year, even if we accept Roman statistics and refrain from asking how many leak away. Yet that leakage is not only confessed by some of the most earnest Romanist preachers, but it is becoming a serious difficulty for the editors of the reference-volume called *The Catholic Who's Who:* what is to be done when a prominent convert, once advertised in that volume, has either notoriously drifted away or requests that his name may be removed?

Common sense suggests that the atmosphere of Infallibility must necessarily be stifling for the human intellect. We have, indeed, a chorus of passionate protests against this natural assumption; enthusiastic converts, especially, tell us that they never felt what real freedom is, until they stepped into the Roman Church and threw the key away. But, even on the face of it, some of these men do seem to protest too much; and, behind this superficially unanimous chorus, an attentive ear may catch clear notes of discord. Here and there an impatient Catholic feels that further disguise is not only useless but contrary to the best interests of the Church; and he tells the world plainly that it may trust its own common sense, after all. Tyrrell (as we have seen) compared the intellectual atmosphere of Romanism to a prison, and Mumbauer (as we shall see) compared it to a Ghetto. While Mr. Belloc froths at the mouth to assure us that nobody but a Romanist can write history, and while his fellow-apologists join with him in protesting that the main bar to conversions lies in the philosophical ignorance of the outer multitude, far abler and more learned Catholics in France and Germany have confessed that Romanist philosophy and history are too often, in fact, as hollow within as they appear to be from without. Abbé Charles Denis wrote, in 1902: " Catholicism in Latin countries has reached a lamentable pass. It must adapt itself to its environment, or it will continue to decay. . . We are languishing because we have refused the discipline of action, and accepted a lifeless immobility within the discipline of dogma. Dogma is a light to lead us on. We have made it a barrier beyond which we must not go. We have become helots in the twentieth century because of our desire that the past should live again. We have no relations with anything that is vital, neither with science, nor with society, nor with the State. . . . We love the Church and its infallible *magisterium*, but on condition that the Church dispenses us from the need of acting, of thinking, of knowing, of loving what is undoubtedly good in our time. The evil is in us. Let us not look for it elsewhere. Let us not be like those invalids who rebel against the advice of the doctor, and throw out of the window the remedies which would restore them, but to which in their folly they attribute their suffering. The evil is in ourselves, and has sunk deep to the innermost recesses of our being."[18]

---

[17] *Eternal Life,* p. 335.

Jules le Roy, an orthodox Catholic of greater learning and ability than any, perhaps, who write at the present day in English, had no illusions on the score of " Catholic philosophy." He wrote, in 1907: " The fact is, that the form too often given nowadays [by us Catholics] to religious affirmations is no longer adapted to men's minds. To those who have received a scientific education, it sometimes appears as a sort of childish mythology. At least, it seems bound up with an out-of-date philosophy, which contemporary thought cannot assimilate. On the whole, it has hardly changed since the Middle Ages, while in other directions the human mind has gone through a deep-reaching renewal."[19]

---

[18] Quoted in A. F. Lilley, *Modernism* (Pitman, 1908), p. 28.
[19] Rifaux, *Conditions*, p. 322.

Döllinger told Dr. Plummer: "I remember that I was once sent by the Government to superintend an examination at Freising. Freising was the first attempt made by the clergy to form a theological college,—started by the Archbishop of Munich and others. The Government wanted to know what was going on there,—what was being taught; and I was sent as commissary. The teacher of philosophy was an old priest, who knew a little scholastic philosophy and had put together a catechism out of the schoolmen, which he dictated to the students and they learnt the answers by heart. The first question was, *Quid est philosophia?* And the answer was, *Ea scientia cujus patrona est Sancta Catharina.* And I was expected to sit by and look serious during such an examination!"[20] This is, of course, an extreme case; in English seminaries, at any rate, the students are taught Thomist philosophy, but far more from manuals than from the original. Even among the most conspicuous Roman Catholic teachers in England I have found two who had evidently formed their ideas of St. Thomas' attitude towards heretics not from the *Summa* itself, but from such manuals as the late Fr. Rickaby's, and their ideas of his attitude towards Biblical inspiration less upon his text than upon the glosses of modern apologists. Every year has brought me fresh confirmation of what a convert of thirty years' standing said to me in 1906: "You Anglicans are equally prone to exaggerate the mendacity of the Jesuits on the one side, and their intelligence or learning on the other." And what he said of the Jesuit, becomes more and more evident of the Romanist in general. Robert Dell, in *The Nineteenth Century and After* for 1900 (Vol. XLVII., p. 681), voiced the feeling of other Roman Catholics besides himself: "No reasonable man will undertake scientific investigation if he is bound to arrive at conclusions already made for him by other people possibly ignorant of the subject." More than one of those who have left Rome in recent years have given for their main reason, as Tyrrell did, the impossibility of freedom of thought. Among these was another Jesuit, the geologist A. Renard, member of the Royal Academy of Belgium, who wrote afterwards: "From this Church which I have left because its teaching and its doctrines are henceforth incompatible with my reason, ripened now by a conscientious search for truth, one ideal has remained with me; that of duty; duty which must be done in spite of everything else."[21]

---

[20] *Expositor,* 1890, Vol. II., p. 130.

---

[21] Houtin, *Crise,* p. 323.

CHAPTER XIII.

LAY IMPOTENCE AND IGNORANCE.

THESE restrictions shackle the laity no less than the clergy, except so far as a layman may be financially more independent. For the best of them—that is, for the men to whom privation of the Sacraments and excommunication are things to be feared even more than the loss of livelihood—the system of censorship and espionage and condemnation may mean intellectual slavery, or a life of continual evasion. A very well-read and thoughtful man may indeed be so happily constituted as to take no special interest, among the thousands of interesting things in this universe, in any of those particular points on which his priesthood are interested in avoiding discussion. But, if his interests are unfortunately too wide, he must either cease to enquire seriously or come up against an unyielding authority. There is no other world-association, nor ever has been, in which the rank and file are so absolutely under the orders of their officers as Roman Catholics; we may emphasise this the more justly here, because elsewhere it is one of their proudest boasts.

The able and plain-spoken Catholic journalist, De Narfon, accepts the Infallibility decree of 1870 in the bare sense of its actual words; but he insists on the extent to which it is abused, in practice, by zealous Romanists who go beyond its bare words, and who thus "raise a barrier between the Church and Society." He continues, "Our bishops, nowadays, commonly say 'Pope's word, God's word'; and they repeat this blasphemy with respect to any word that has fallen from the Pope's lips. And, as for themselves, we know well enough that they seldom dare to raise their voices, unless it be to applaud everything that comes from Rome or to transmit Roman commands to their flocks. In this universal debasement of the episcopacy, how could the laity remember that, after all, they have something else to do in the Church beyond paying for the upkeep of the services? Most of them have followed the episcopal example; they have thrown up the sponge. Nowadays, the most eminent lay folk are reduced to silence. It is notorious how Brunetière[1] was treated because, in the anguish of his thoroughly Catholic and thoroughly French soul, he had dared to offer advice which the Pope had not asked of him. Between one day and the next, men began to spit upon this masterly and lofty intellect, this man who had worked his way up to religious faith by hard thinking, this unrivalled orator and marvellous apologist whom Catholics had become accustomed to regard as a sort of Father of the Church; this man to whom Leo XIII. had opened his heart. Men called him in derision 'the Green Cardinal,' and they intimated to him that he had no right to speak. Brunetière, already attacked by a mortal malady, suffered deeply from this unjust turn in the tide of opinion, and from its black ingratitude. It so sickened him that, fighter as he was, he made no attempt to struggle—but we must remember that he was already under sentence of death. He said to me one day (and I shall never forget the tone of his voice), 'It is painful to cut a figure as a heretic!' And he strove—whether he succeeded, I know not—to cut off all interest in religious matters, and to devote himself solely to the less tumultuous and less treacherous study of literature."[2] In another book, he complains no less bitterly of the humiliating rôle to which even the educated laity are reduced. He is speaking of the absence of financial control. "The faithful are asked to show generosity; and I agree that the clergy have the right and even the duty of asking this from them. But have not the laity also the right—and perhaps even the duty—of asking seriously what is done with their money? Lay folk, in former days, counted for more in the Church. In our days, religious authorities seem a little too inclined to see nothing in the laity but a flock, to which they grant no other rôle than that of following its shepherds with docility. Those are the very terms which the present Pope [Pius X.] has used in his Encyclical *Gravissimo*."[3] This same feeling is evidently growing in England. The *London Catholic Herald* of March 2nd, 1929, had an article describing the "widespread interest aroused among Catholics" by a debate in the "Catholic citizens' Parliament," in which the Right Hon. James F. Hope had proposed a real parochial system, of "parish councils, with a treasurer and other officers to relieve the priest of many temporal burdens." He was promptly fallen upon by "Right Rev. Mgr. Provost Moriarty, D.D., V.G., speaking in the Hippodrome Theatre, Birkenhead, on Sunday night to an audience of nearly two thousand people, under the auspices of the Shrewsbury Diocesan Council of the Catholic Young Men's Society, the Right Rev. Dr. Singleton, Bishop of Shrewsbury, presiding." "Tithes" (the Provost said) "belonged to the priest; the churchwardens had nothing whatever to do with them. The idea of reform might be good, or it might not, but it was certainly not Catholic and not mediæval. The Church was not a democracy; no power came to the Church from the people. She was a monarchy, and the only one, by Divine right, to whom all power came from above. She claimed her temporalities, but thereby gave away no power." (*Catholic Times*, March 15th, 1929.) "Mr. Hope," said Provost Moriarty in another sentence, "might be a great politician; but his knowledge of ecclesiastical law was sadly lacking."

---

[1] Editor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* and, in his later life, an ardent champion of Catholicism.

[2] *Athèna,* Fév., 1911, p. 222.

We need hardly seek further than this for the explanation of Newmăn's impatient protest quoted on p. 63 above. A laity treated thus by a clergy whose education and outlook is such as we know the ordinary Romanist education and outlook to be, is not likely to be highly educated, in any sense which most men attach nowadays to that term. On this point of lay education, Fr. Knox seems even further from the truth than on the other. He writes in his *Spiritual Aeneid* (p. 24): "A boy brought up at [the Roman Catholic School of] Downside finds himself at home in a hideous little mission church full of gimcrack images, because his religion has taught him to fly to the centre of things, and neglect the differences of external circumstances." Michelet, long ago, looked below the surface of this claim, and found a contrary truth. The Briton, as he points out, beat the Frenchman in those pioneer days of America, and almost the whole of that northern continent now speaks English, in virtue of the Englishman's superior independence of outward circumstances. The Frenchman was dependent upon his priest, and easily contracted unions with the natives; the Englishman, "avec sa Bible et son Anglaise," was at home everywhere. The remark is all the more significant because Michelet did not love the English, and because he knew the Middle Ages better than most men. And the same spirit which carried Britain on in the eighteenth century survives, under different forms, to the present day. I have already quoted the Frenchman who recently remarked to me, as a self-evident fact, on the more general feeling of religion in England, and the Belgian professor who confessed, though less explicitly, to a similar experience.

---

[3] *Séparation*, p. 257.

Fr. Knox does not take the low view of Anglican Public School religion which we have sometimes seen in violent letters addressed to the *Church Times*. Indeed, I should like to confess here that, after thirty years of direct communication with Public School boys, and eighteen with undergraduates, I found in Fr. Knox's *Spiritual Aeneid* what seems to me the justest estimate, for good and evil, that I have read anywhere: an estimate which, like much else in that same book, makes us feel the contrast between the special pleading or the random generalisations of some passages, and the personal charm of the writer. It is when he comes to direct controversy that those less engaging elements come out.

He writes in one place: "A class in 'apologetics' is part of the normal curriculum of a Catholic School. Catholic boys are learning to defend the existence of God at an age when you and I, reader, were dismally memorising facts about the career of Jehoshaphat, and fleshing our teeth in the South Galatian theory."[4] And again he makes "*Paterfamilias* of the local evening paper" ask "Why, if Catholics can propagate their errors with such success in the mind of youth, cannot the sober Anglicanism I love be taught to my son as Divinity? Why is Monday morning devoted to the barren scenes of Israel's wanderings, the waste waters sailed by itinerant Apostles? Why, in short, cannot the schools teach religion instead of theology?"

The contrast which he here attempts to bring out is, I believe, entirely false. In the first place, this Romanist education of which he writes without personal experience is estimated very differently by a Romanist inspector and other authorities whose words will be found below in my chapter XIX.; these men are specially doubtful as to the value of "apologetics," except in certain cases. But (and this is perhaps more important still) our ordinary English Public School boys, however true it may be that some of their time is wasted, are, in fact, compelled by their Divinity lessons to learn something of the Bible itself. A distinguished Jesuit professor, Dr. E. Michael of Innsbruck, quotes in a learned monograph, without the least suspicion that he is quoting from the Bible, the similes of the she-bear robbed of her whelps, and of the eagle that hasteneth to the prey.[5] It is not at all uncommon to find distinguished French lay folk falling into similar pitfalls, through unfamiliarity with texts known to most of our sixth-form boys. Again, my own personal experience of a year and a half at a French Lycée, though it was very early and I would not insist too much upon it, has left me with an impression of definite inferiority to the English Public School, both in religion and in morals. Moreover, certain Roman Catholics whose experience is drawn from a far wider acquaintance with actual Roman Catholic conditions than Father Knox's, have come to very different conclusions. Let me here quote four, of whom three speak explicitly of religious education.

---

[4] *The Belief of Catholics,* p. 44.

Our first witness shall be from *Steps Towards Reunion,* by the Rev. J. Duggan, who describes himself on the title page (1897) as " Catholic Priest of Maidstone, and author of *The Life of Christ.*" The book is that of an evidently orthodox Roman Catholic, really concerned for the union of Christendom, with no Protestant sympathies, but recognising that Protestants had real provocations for the revolt of the sixteenth century, and that those provocations, in so far as they still exist, must be removed before Anglicans can be expected to come into the Roman fold. He emphasises the fact that the Westminster Penny Catechism contains very important statements to which the Catholic Church has never committed herself, even at the Trent and Vatican Councils; and he criticises the attitude of the hierarchy towards modern education at the elementary schools and at the Universities. " They refuse absolution to people who try to obtain a good education for their children [at non-Romanist institutions]. . . . And now we allow our children to go without a good education so that they may not miss learning a Catechism that contains, as I have shown, much that God has not revealed and that the Church does not teach " (pp. 227—8). He speaks of this as one of the greatest of those "unrealities" which underlie the apparent unanimity of Roman Catholics on all important questions. Men disagree, but allow the clergy to speak of them as if they agreed. "That is what we call loyalty to authority. But does it deserve to be called loyalty? Or does it deserve to be called flattery and servility?" (pp. 196—7).

---

[5] I have noted this in *From St. Francis to Dante,* 1st ed., p. 11.

Edouard le Roy was a distinguished mathematical professor. He was one of a small group of "normaliens"—a distinction answering to a fellowship at the most exacting of English colleges—who have been much concerned to defend Catholicism. He confessed in 1907: "For a long time, Catholic thought . . . . has ceased to direct the movement of men's minds, and even has no notable influence upon them. . . . The first note of our religious situation, from the intellectual point of view, is extreme ignorance. This ignorance is very widespread, and sometimes reaches a truly incredible pitch. . . . It is certain that in some regions of France, and in some social environments, [the dechristianisation of the masses] is almost complete; and here the separation of Church and State will soon bring more than one sham façade to the ground. . . . The fact is palpable, written on every page of our history for the last two centuries, that we Catholics had all the cards in our hand, every power, every influence; and yet we have not been able to rear generations of believers . . . we have persistently misunderstood two great forces which are the essential factors of the modern world—Science and Democracy. . . . Religious ignorance is almost as great among the Catholics as among their adversaries.[6] How many could say, with any precision, what their faith consists in, and what it rests upon? How many are formally heretics, without knowing it?[7] How many profess maxims directly contrary to the very spirit of Christianity? Things sometimes go further still. Let me merely cite for instance a certain press which noisily proclaims itself as a Catholic. It is shabby, to begin with; but that matters little; what does matter is, that it is odious in its methods, its violence, its calumny and its bad faith, and in its shameless exploitation of a pretended orthodoxy of which it claims the monopoly; in short, it is profoundly antichristian. After all this, why should we be surprised that our contradictors ignore us, when we ourselves are so ignorant as this? . . . Among too many Catholics, political preoccupations seem to be far more important than strictly religious preoccupations. It looks as if their one business was to get into power." Too many families (he says) neglect religious education; and "in too many secondary schools, alas! the situation is the same; their religious instruction is lamentable. It is thrust into the last rank of mere accessories; here we have the palpable fact that Catholics have had full liberty of teaching for fifty years, and that they have formed scarcely anything but a considerable number of

---

[6] It must be borne in mind that the "adversaries" to whom he refers here are far less the Protestants of France (a very small body numerically) than the free-thinkers and anticlericals.

---

[7] An interesting example of this occurred in a recent correspondence in *The Nation and Athenæum* (May 21st—June 25th, 1927). A zealous Roman Catholic, Mr. F. J. Gorman, asserted that "no Catholic" held the Sacraments to be "dependent upon 'intentions'"; and Mr. J. W. Poynter showed how flatly this assertion contradicted one of the best known decrees of the Council of Trent. The like sometimes happens to those enthusiastic Anglicans who are most zealous to expound mediæval orthodoxy. Quite recently, Sir Henry Slesser undertook to enlighten the world about the true doctrine of Transubstantiation. He not only flew in the face of Aquinas and other schoolmen, but actually commended as orthodox, on the authority of the Council of Trent, the very proposition upon which the Council had taken the trouble to lay its formal anathema. Incredible as it sounds in a lawyer, he had read this legal document in the sense of *commanding* the doctrines which in fact it *curses* as heretical! (*Times,* Nov. 11th, 1927; *The Times* refused to print a brief letter in which I pointed this out.)

bacheliers, or of successful candidates for the colleges of St. Cyr and the Polytechnic. The result of all this is that, too often, we note a literal paganism among them. . . . Men don't know, don't think, what they believe. Perhaps they don't profess agnosticism; but they practise it. The want of criticism engenders illimitable credulity, ready to be taken in by any hoax; we need not go far to quote illustrious examples.[8] . . . How many of us [lay folk] dare to busy ourselves with properly and specifically dogmatic questions? That is where our first weakness lies. The fact is, we seem to have nothing to say; and that, to begin with, is why men have ceased to listen to us." "Us," of course, means the sincere and thoughtful Catholics; as for the rest, they have only too much to say. "In short, from the intellectual point of view, Catholicism, as incarnate in some of its defenders, seems fruitful nowadays only in negations and in anathemas. In that direction, however, it shows deplorable fertility. What can be said of certain apologies? What, above all, can be said of the devices which are brought into play against those who try to live and to think? Insults, backbiting, calumnies—men stick at nothing. It would be easy here to give precise details and examples, and I would do so if it were not too easy and too painful a task. It must be said plainly; certain condemnations, certain proceedings, certain manners [*mœurs*] form incomparably the worst factor in our present intellectual situation; because, in that field, the conflict with morality comes out even more plainly than the conflict with intelligence."

Yet (continues Le Roy) what I have said refers more exactly to a few years ago than to the present moment. "A movement of revival has begun"; "religious questions preoccupy men more and more." "Among unbelievers, really impartial studies, founded on documents, multiply from day to day; we are no longer at the foolishly mocking or scornful stage, the unintelligent enmity, the triumphant dogmatism, the sort of inverted clericalism, of which there were so many examples in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. . . . Among believers, in the same way, the work that has been done is already enormous; during the last fifteen or twenty years an enormous transformation has taken place, to which eloquent testimony is borne by books, reviews, and the teaching of Catholic Seminaries or Institutes"; and the future promises better still. "Must I insist further, and briefly recall the recent victories of the new spirit? I will speak especially of what Catholics have done, for it is only just to recognise that, up to the present, it is to them that most of the progress accomplished is due. In history and exegesis, it will suffice to quote the sufficiently significant names of Mgr. Duchesne and M. Loisy. As for the former, let my reader measure the ground that has been covered since the days when that controversy raged concerning the Apostolicity of the French Churches, down to the publication of that *Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise,* which is now unanimously admired and accepted! Let him also note all the doctrinal consequences implied in that *History,* all that the book says clearly and irrefutably to all who know how to read! Such an example as this shows us what a future is in store for the theses of M. Loisy. Already, in spite of screams and threats, in spite of manœuvres to stifle and obstruct them, they are progressing and spreading irresistibly; the day is near when they will be recognised on all hands for what they are—the reconciliation of criticism and faith, a deepening and not a weakening of faith, one of the most fruitful principles of future Apologetics; and, particularly, the true Apologetics of the Church and of Authority. . . . It is not true that the evolution that is now being produced is a revolution, or that this revival is inspired by a spirit of revolt. Never was Catholic unity closer or more solid, nor submission more cordial and complete; never was the idea of any sort of schism so far from men's minds." Yet all this progress can be solid only in so far as it is sincere. The conservative clergy must cease to blow hot and cold; "to combat in one direction [i.e. against the adversaries of the Church] a certain narrow and static idea of orthodoxy, while on the other side you utilise [that same static idea] in order to confound those [of your own writers] who show, in practice, that this narrow idea is neither the only one nor the true one." "In a word, do not so defend Catholic truth as to forget to be Christians."[9]

---

[8] The obvious reference here is to Dreyfus, Taxil and Diana Vaughan. See my Chapter XV. here below.

This criticism of the immediate past, these warnings for the present, and these hopes for the future, may now be estimated in the light of accomplished facts. Le Roy's book in which he attempted to reconcile science and faith had already, when he wrote, been prohibited by the Cardinal Vicar at Rome and the Archbishop of Paris (May, 1906). In February, 1907, *Le Siècle* published the names of six priests who had recently given up their Orders in the single diocese of Arras.[10] In July, 1907, the Papal decree *Lamentabili* condemned many of Loisy's propositions, and at least one of Le Roy's.[11] In March, 1908, Loisy was finally excommunicated. In 1911, Duchesne's *Histoire* was forbidden in all the Seminaries; and in January, 1912, it was put upon the Index.

Here, again, is what Mr. Michael J. F. McCarthy writes in his *Priests and People in Ireland* (Dublin, 1902), pp. 576ff. "If the Catholic body politic in Ireland be divided into ten parts we shall find that perhaps one-tenth is in possession of either wealth or liberal competence, and is endowed with a certain amount of intellectual strength, which, *apparently and superficially,* puts them on a level with Protestants. In trivial attainments, such as literary taste and the species of 'culture' which waxes eloquent over Anne Hathaway but is incapable of assimilating a single Shakespearian sentiment, the Catholic one-tenth to which I allude, perhaps surpass the Protestants. The bulk of this Catholic one-tenth are what would be styled Nonconformist if they belonged to the Church of England—and in the Church of England, people like them would openly become Nonconformists. It is doubtful if any of them really and fully believe in what the priests call 'The Faith.' They never leave the True Church: they are too indifferent; they hold themselves quite apart from the remaining nine-tenths of the Catholic laity; they toddle to mass somnambulistically on Sunday; they leave all the rest to the sacerdotal experts; they think it is fashionable to be Roman Catholic, and regard themselves as 'antiques' in human nature—genuine, spurious, or modern 'antiques'—to use the language of the dealer. Underneath this 'antique' tenth there are two-tenths perhaps, who indignantly fume against the pretensions of the priests, but who conform nevertheless to a great many, but by no means to all, of the demands of 'The Faith.' The remaining seven-tenths of the laity are what General Booth would describe as 'submerged,' and it is from the submerged seven-tenths that the priests are now drawn. As long as the priest has power, those seven-tenths will never, if he can prevent it, rise up from their submersion. He knows them well: for he belongs to them: and he can manage them." Mr. J. W. Poynter, who joined the Roman Catholic Church in 1907 and left it in 1926, writes: "The late Mgr. Grosch, of Islington, told me personally that, of the boys leaving Roman Catholic elementary schools, between sixty and eighty per cent give up the practice of their religion."[12]

---

[9] Rifaux, *Conditions,* pp. 312ff.

[10] *Crise,* p. 331.

[11] *Mod. Cath.,* pp. 166—7.

Finally, here is a complaint from Roman Catholic Germany.

---

[12] *Roman Catholic Propaganda.* (Protestant Truth Society, 1929.) p. 10.

"Rome of to-day, in her attempt to impose upon all the faithful, with the same strict authority, her dogmas, her discipline, her pedagogy and even her politics, is playing admirably into the hands of her enemies. As Mumbauer has put it neatly, she is rebuilding the Ghetto in the midst of the modern State, and she is shutting the Catholics up in it. Wherever she can, she creates special Universities or Faculties, in order to keep young students away from the public establishments and to withdraw them from official science, with its progress and its methods. . . . Science goes on without them [the Catholics]; progress in social life is realised without them. They have become useless members of civilised society." A body of German Catholics has published a formal complaint that they are no longer outlawed, but put outside of civilisation; and they demand the suppression of the Index.[13]

In Italy, even more than in England, France or Germany, the ignorance or supineness of the priesthood reacts upon the religious education of the laity. I have been told more than once, on good authority, that things are still worse in Spain; but of Italy I can speak with some personal knowledge. Conditions there are such as Mrs. Waterfield (Lina Duff-Gordon) describes picturesquely, but with essential truth, in her *Home Life in Italy*, pp. 225ff. She is describing, not the more backward south, but an average village and little town of the centre, at no great distance from the busy industrial centre of Carrara; the year is 1908.

"Latterly has come up the problem of religious teaching. At present religious dogmatic teaching may only be given if the parents request it; and the children of those who have not made the formal demand may not be present at the lesson. One party wishes to make religious teaching obligatory, and is endeavouring to find a basis upon which Roman Catholics and Jews may agree—surely a work for the magician! The question has become a political war-cry, and municipal elections are often decided by it. The teachers, so far as I have been able to find out, are against the motion. Many of them, earnestly religious people, give moral teaching, and have prayers before the children leave. But as the new spirit of reasoning has come among them, while they may believe in the great truths of the Roman faith, they would find it impossible to teach the entire catechism of the diocese with sincerity. They say that it would be only fair to give the duty over to the priests, who have more than enough time on their hands. At present the parish priest is supposed to give the children religious instruction every Thursday; many let the duty slide. The priest of Brunella used to prepare the children so badly for their confirmation, that in sheer pity Lucia's mother for many years undertook the duty herself. If the teachers have their way, the Italian will continue to remain in ignorance of his religion. The village priest is more often than not an ignorant person, who gabbles a rigmarole, which serves as Latin for himself and his parishioners. All Brunella laughed the other day when the priest's niece brought her Latin exercise to the schoolmaster (she was taking private lessons) and it was a mass of blunders from beginning to end. She did not ask her uncle to help her another time. I had often noticed the ignorance of the people about their favourite feasts; Candlemas was just *una festa della Madonna,* and the reason of their being given candles in church was never thought of; while the Epiphany was *la festa della Befana!* They say their rosary the whole time of the Mass and seldom are able to tell what part in the service the priest has reached. But I was unprepared for the surprise I lately experienced at Carrara. I went one Sunday evening with Mariannina to see a cinematograph.[14] The theatre was packed with people —ladies with wonderful erections on their heads sitting in the boxes; artisans, quarry-men and marble workers in the pit and in the gallery. I sat among Mariannina's friends and innumerable relations. The performance was amazing to a northern mind. First of all we saw the London streets full of traffic, then the working of a marble quarry, and an idyllic picture of Gabrielle D'Annuzio picnicking on a hill-side in a panama hat, followed by a series of comic pictures which elicited gargantuan laughter. Before we had time to recover from our mirth the Life of Christ passed in vivid and realistic scenes before us. No sacred or painful details were omitted: Christ sat with his disciples at the Last Supper and pronounced the sacred words, which a man murmured behind me. The shuddering figure in the flagellation fell and nearly swooned; then the scene quickly changed and the face of the *Ecce Homo* was displayed in more than life size, every quiver of the eyelids, every tremor and spasm revealed. Neither was any detail in the Crucifixion denied the audience, who took an unimaginative delight in the painfully realistic spectacle. As the familiar story of the Gospels was unfolded a volley of questions came from all round. Why were they killing the poor babies? What was the Madonna doing wandering about on a donkey? Who was the boy sawing wood with the old man? Oh, that is a marriage feast, but what is *Nostro Signore* doing with the *conca* of water? and who is the man walking out of his grave? and why does *Nostro Signore* walk upon the sea? I found it difficult in telling the story to Mariannina to keep pace with both the pictures and her questions. She kept saying to me: 'Oh, what a beautiful tale! where can I read all this? Yes, of course I know about the birth of Christ in a stable, and the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection and Ascension, but all the rest is quite new to me.' Other women looked on stolidly and cared not to know anything of what they saw. 'Our husbands know all these things, they are very well educated,' they said with evident pride, and there the matter ended. The children ran to their fathers, but not all were able to make the pictures clear to them. I think at the time everyone's attention was fixed, but afterwards many of the men pretended to have been thoroughly bored by the whole performance. The angel who was constantly appearing to bring messages or chase away Pharisees was much appreciated by young and old; he was an ingenious cross between the fairy in tights at Drury Lane and the St. George by Raphael in the Louvre."

---

[13] Pernot, p. 144; cf. 141ff.

---

[14] Mariannina was the head housemaid, a very intelligent widow.

Just as I go to press, a friend sends me a cutting from *The Daily Herald* of Dec. 31st, 1929, which deserves permanent record. "A man in the Greenwich Coroner's Court yesterday objected to taking the oath 'on a Church of England Bible,' on the ground that his Church did not allow him to do so. He did not open the Old Testament offered to him, and Dr. Whitehouse, the coroner, remarked: 'We have hundreds of Roman Catholics who come here and are just as orthodox as you, and they take the oath on the Old Testament.' The Man: 'It is not for me to condemn it. A distinction is made for Jewish people, and they are not allowed to take the oath on the Church of England Testament.' Dr. Whitehouse: 'It is not a Church of England Testament. You will have to take the oath whatever you take it on.'—'If I am made to do so, I must, but I protest strongly, because the Roman Catholic Church does not uphold the teaching of the Church of England.' Replying to a request to state his objection, the man said, 'I have not studied the Old Testament to that extent, but the Book I accept is the one sanctioned by the Pope.' He was then asked to mention the Books of the Bible he would accept, and he replied, 'Well, there are The Acts and Job. I cannot remember any more.' Eventually, at the suggestion of the coroner, the man affirmed."

CHAPTER XIV.

ROMANIST HISTORY.

ALREADY, incidentally, the reader has had several opportunities for judging in this field; but the subject needs more detailed treatment. It is not only that we outsiders can see how definitely the Romanist historian is bound down, by his creed, to arrive at certain prescribed results; but we have seen the working of this system in the actual lives of men. It is not only that the evil result seems inevitable *a priori,* but also that the practical effect is just what the theory would suggest. To take only two examples; Houtin's life was wrecked by hierarchical pressure, and Duchesne, though he was a born diplomat as well as a born historian, struggled (in Newman's expressive phrase) "like the Persians driven to fight under the lash."[1]

We have seen how Newman complained that "unless one doctored all one's facts [in history] one would be thought a bad Catholic"; and Wilfrid Ward's comment upon this shows that it was no mere random outcry or passing mood. "Even so tentative an effort at historical frankness in his own article in the *Rambler,* on 'consulting the Faithful,' was suspected. How could Catholics in such circumstances take a place among the scientific historians of the day and plead the cause of the Church with success?"[2] More than thirty years later, Robert Dell was still complaining of the same difficulty, in his protest against the views of current orthodoxy as voiced by the formidable Jesuit controversialist, Richard Clarke. Dealing with Clarke's "system of substituting *a priori* assumptions for the investigation of facts" in history, and especially with his assertion that Roman dogma has remained unchanged through the centuries, Dell went on: "That such statements can be made by any Catholic fifty-five years after the publication of the *Essay on Development* shows that there are some among us who learn nothing and forget nothing. . . . The ignorant and unintelligent, as De Tocqueville said, open their ears and their hearts to a writer who appeals entirely to general principles (which are sometimes only popular prejudices); who is intelligible to them because he confines himself to the extreme development of a theory, and is therefore 'simple'; who is untrammelled by a regard for facts, and instead of trying to discover the truth of the matter, tries to make the facts agree with his preconceived notion of what the truth ought to be. For the ignorant and unintelligent usually find that such a writer agrees with the conclusions that they themselves have deduced from prejudice; and they hail him as a heaven-sent prophet. The power of the dominant school in the Catholic Church arises from the fact that the minds of Catholics, in the main, are not really educated."[3]

---

[1] Ward's *Newman,* Vol. I., p. 586; cf. p. 503 for Newman's painful sense of the historical ignorance of the Bishops who held him in the hollow of their hand.

[2] *Life,* Vol. I., p. 571.

Great emphasis is sometimes laid upon Leo XIII's generosity in opening the Vatican library to students just as all other great libraries had long since been opened; but on this subject we may hear the comments of the authors of *Ce qu'on a fait de l'Eglise:* "Men quote [from Job] 'Hath God any need of your lie?' and they cite those strong words of Leo XIII. on the study of history (Aug. 18th, 1883). *Ne quid veri dicere non audeat,* said the great Pope, recalling Cicero's words: 'let not the Church historian hesitate to tell the truth.' Unluckily, facts give the lie to these fine and good words, and it is not difficult to prove this." The Biblical Commission has told students that they may search and judge "according to the laws of criticism," but it adds, "paying due regard to the judgment of the Church." Now, "if the Church recognises the laws of criticism, ought she not to accept the verdict of those laws? To admit that the laws of criticism ought to be the judges in such investigations, and then to say that the Church has the final judgment, looks like withdrawing with one hand what you give with the other, and exposing oneself (a serious matter) to the suspicion of insincerity." Not only may Duchesne be quoted here, but the almost equally celebrated F. X. Kraus, of Freiburg. Pious critics, unable to deny his facts (for which he gave documentary proof) blamed him for his "bad spirit." "He was summoned to Rome and compelled to modify his book. When you compare the original with the corrected edition of 1887, you may reckon the sacrifices imposed upon him, which he accepted for the sake of peace. It is easy, in face of such facts, to see how just is the reproach of those who accuse us of distorting truth and of putting mendacious edification above veracity" (p. 257).

---

[3] *Nineteenth Century and After,* Vol. XLVII. (1900), p. 682.

Here, again, is a sidelight upon the boasted full accessibility of the Vatican archives; a light all the more interesting since the narrator rose finally to the post of Prefect of the Vatican Library. I have not been able to get at the Review from which it is quoted; but the authors who cite it are accurate in all cases where I have checked them, and the story bears every stamp of authenticity: it is, in fact, corroborated in the main by the *Leaves from my Diary* which the Cardinal published to give his own version of the negotiations concerning Anglican Orders.[4] The authors of *Ce qu'on a fait de l'Eglise* (p. 270) quote as follows from *Revue Catholique des Eglises,* Jan., 1905, pp. 45—7:—"A great deal of fuss was made, a few years ago, when Leo XIII's liberal and enlightened genius decided to open the Vatican archives to all searchers. It was a fine gesture, noble and proud, but dangerous. Therefore, although the Pope had shown his will, the Curia would not. Let us be allowed here to quote an example where the two powers, that of Right and that of Fact, were confronted with each other. There was no doubt about the victory; it was won by the Power of Fact; that is, the Curia. It was at the time of the controversy about Anglican Orders; and here is the story told by Dom Gasquet, the celebrated English Benedictine. He writes, 'The Pope having commissioned me to begin by looking up all the evidence bearing upon this matter, and to make a report to him, signed an order to that effect, which gave me full liberty to study all that the Holy Office [of the Inquisition] possessed in the way of bulls, letters and memorials on that question. I presented myself in person next day, with Leo's order, to the Director of the Holy Office, Mgr. de Ségur, who received me very cordially and told me to come back next week. I came back next week, but only to receive the same answer. This kind of thing went on for seven weeks. My patience began to give way; I wrote to Merry del Val a letter to the effect that, in spite of my permission signed by the Holy Father, I could not get into the Holy Office to examine the papers which I needed to see. Next day, I received a message that the Pope wished to see me immediately. I went to his apartments; and, when I reached his presence, he came to me, caught me by my hood, and shook it nervously, saying at the same time in a tone of displeasure: "Abbé, why are you angry with the Holy Father? Do you not know that nobody ought ever to be angry with the Pope?" I did not know what to think; and, feeling that I might as well get a reprimand for a grave offence as for a trifle, I said: "You ordered me to do that work, and I cannot do it without certain documents from the Holy Office; and, in spite of your approbation, I cannot get at these indispensable materials." Then the Pope, going from his seat to the opposite corner of the room, drew aside a piece of tapestry and uncovered a large box containing the documents. On the lid was the order signed by the Pope for Mgr. de Ségur. The reasons against my having access to these documents were written across it.' It is evident that Dom Gasquet, but for his perseverance in calling at the Holy Office, and in spite of the formal order signed by the Pope, would never even have seen the documents (probably carefully sifted, as it was) which he was permitted to see. What, then, had the Curia so important to conceal? and what sort of honesty is it which, even for a report to the Pope, begins by cooking the documents?"

---

[4] Burns & Oates, 1911, p. 33. He there writes: "I had for weeks been waiting. . . . For one reason or another, I had been constantly put off, and, somewhat losing patience, I had written to the Vatican to know whether the Pope wanted me to see the papers or not."

In 1903, when Leo XIII. founded his Biblical Commission, this also was greeted with a great flourish of trumpets; yet it is a hollow sham behind an imposing façade. Pernot described it seven years later, when it had got well into working order. "Formed on the model of the Roman congregations, it was no exception to the main rule, which consists in putting competence on one side and authority on another. Competence may be found among the Consultators[5] who study the questions and give their opinion in a report; authority is reserved exclusively for the Cardinal members of the Commission, who render a decision in conformity with or in contradiction to the opinion expressed in the report submitted to them. . . At the end of the session a certain number of decisions are formulated and published, but no reasons are given. It has often been noted that these decisions seem dictated rather by opportunism and internal policy, than by technical reasons. But it must not be forgotten that technical reasons, though they may impose themselves upon the examination of the competent Consultators, who are by no means prepared by their previous studies to solve problems of history or of criticism, and who, for the most part, are ignorant of the languages in which those texts are written which are being discussed. Until the last few years, in fact, the teaching of Greek was quite exceptional in Italian Seminaries; Hebrew was not taught at all. The decisions of the Biblical Commission, hitherto, have not been such as to encourage among Catholic students any taste for scientific and disinterested research."[6]

---

[5] This is an indulgent concession; Father Lépicier, at any rate, was among these consultators, and it is probable that his services to the cause of reaction on that Commission earned him his Cardinalate.

Belgium is perhaps the country in which the Roman Church has most power over all the schools of the country; and here is what children are probably still taught and certainly were recently taught, in this present century.[7] The *Sacred History for the use of Upper Forms,* by Canon Menuge (Paris, 1904), teaches in so many words, " Adam came straight from God's hands in a state of perfection, adorned with all knowledge which could profit him. He had a complete language, adapted to his rich intelligence." The Creation may possibly have taken place 3,000 years earlier than Bossuet places it—that is, the world may possibly be nearly 10,000 years old—but, on the other hand, geologists cannot be trusted. This book, Cauderlier tells us, is a standard work in Belgian schools. For primary schools, the popular authority is Dr. Schuster, translated by Abbé Couissinier. Here, says Cauderlier, we have " Creation in six days, without any mention of epochs or periods; on the fourth day God created the sun and moon, when the earth was already beautiful, green with leaves and adorned with thousands of trees and flowers. That day God also created an innumerable multitude of stars. Man was created 4,963 years before Christ, from the clay; Eve was drawn from his side; the serpent talks and makes them eat the fruit of the Tree of Good and Evil; the Deluge was universal and absolute. . . . The edition of 1907 forms a volume, in boards, 300 pages thick, with 113 engravings, two maps, and a view of the Holy Land; all this at 1 franc [pre-war], in order to suit all purses. That is the teaching which appears to enjoy all the favours of the Church. It is patronised, in fact, by a pope and more than 100 bishops and archbishops, including those of Liége and Malines. There have already been sixteen French and fifty-seven German editions. It may be said that this book sows error broadcast. This, apparently, is their way of obeying the often-vaunted prescription of Leo XIII. in his Brief of Aug. 18th, 1883: 'The first law of history is not to dare to lie; the second is, not to fear telling the truth.'"

---

[6] Pernot, p. 224.

[7] My authority here is Em. Cauderlier, *Les Conflits entre la Science et les Enseignements de l'Eglise* (Brussels, Lebègue), p. 50.

Hoensbroech (I. 67) describes the official Jesuit education in History. "The attitude of the [Jesuit] *Ratio Studiorum* to history reveals an excess of didactic confusion and stupidity. It declines to recognise it as an independent branch of study, and what could be more wrong-headed and stupid than the regulations laid down in the following:—Part IV., cp. 12 of the Constitutions mentions History as a part of the Humanities, and the 'new' *Ratio* of 1832 relegates it in a single word to 'Rhetoric.' 'The first known regulation for the systematic treatment of history' in Jesuit institutions dates from the eighteenth century and even this 'is only concerned with Biblical History.' Even at the present day the Constitutions and Study Schemes of the Order recognise no systematic treatment of history. My experiences at the Jesuit College at Wynandstrade will suffice to show how history is taught in the 'Rhetoric' of the Order." This concrete illustration here promised comes on p. 121. "A curious specimen of a professor was the excellent Father Brischar, who taught us history. He deserves this epithet, because of his kindly, inoffensive disposition and his sincere piety. But as professor of history he was beneath criticism. His conceptions of history were positively grotesque. On his historical stage all the characters were angels or devils, with Providence to play the parts of stage-manager and prompter. A good Catholic was counted among the angels, though he might be an Alexander VI., Philip II. of Spain, Alba, Henry IV. of France, Queen Mary I. of England; those who were not good Catholics were classed with the ranks of Satan. Pragmatic connections, human developments, psychological explanations were unknown; everything in history is guided and directed by God with a sole regard for the Church and Papacy. In German history Father Brischar recognised only the Habsburg Emperors, and the most bigoted of these received the most detailed treatment. Although most of us were Prussians, we never heard any mention of Prussian history, except the circumstance that some of the writings of the 'infidel' Frederick II., who, of course, lacked his designation 'Great,' had been placed on the Index of forbidden books."

Chaine, after pointing out how many of the most prominent sceptics or anti-clericals in France had begun as pupils of Jesuit or other strictly "religious" schools, adds: "Who will ever know how far these fine intellects were diverted from Christianity by the very means that were used to teach it to them? No doubt, their teachers did not go so far as to say that Torquemada was burned by the Jews. But how many equivocations were there, how many reticences and guilty attenuations in the accounts given to them (for instance) concerning that criminal institution which is called *Inquisition*."[8]

Rifaux, naming eight of his most distinguished collaborators, and calling attention to what they have said, adds: "It transpires clearly from these essays that Catholics, alas! cut a poor figure from the triple point of view of History, Philosophy and Science. We are scarcely even beginning to employ the legitimate historical methods. Our Scripture histories are written in defiance of the most elementary rules of History. True statements, doubtful and false, are still presented indiscriminately in the same breath."[9]

---

[8] *Les Catholiques*, etc., p. 82; cf. 89ff, 94.

A friend wrote from Rome to Tyrrell: "The trial here . . . comes from historico-critical incompetence and worldly political ambitions."[10] How, indeed, could it be otherwise when even Leo XIII., who had a reputation exceptional among the Popes for scholarship and liberality, and who could so unctuously quote Cicero and Job in favour of strict truth in history, could also say, almost in the same breath, as he did in his Encyclical on the study of Church History: "Those who study it must never lose sight of the fact that it contains a collection of dogmatic facts which are binding upon faith, and which no man is permitted to call in doubt."[11]

The reader will presently see how faithfully these and similar instructions were followed, at about that time, by the dignitary whom English Romanist newspapers celebrated as "our only historian." But, since then, another has arisen who needs brief notice here. Of Mr. Belloc's practice, I shall give instances in a later chapter; but here is the place to deal with the theory of history expounded by him and by Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P. The latter has written: "The real truth is —though it always sounds an invidious thing to say it; scholars outside the Catholic Church cannot rightly handle history."[12] And the former, speaking of judgments in the historical field: "A Catholic is not relatively right in his blame, he is absolutely right."[18]

---

[9] *Conditions*, p. 40.

[10] *Life*, Vol. II., p. 291.

[11] Encyclical Letter to the Archbishops, Bishops and Clergy of France, Sept. 8th, 1899. "Ceux qui l'étudient ne doivent jamais perdre de vue qu'elle renferme un ensemble de faits dogmatiques, qui s'imposent à la foi et qu'il n'est permis à personne de révoquer en doute." C. Mirbt, *Quellen, z. G. d. Papsttums*, 1901, p. 414.

[12] *Dublin Review*, Vol. CLXVIII. (1921), p. 70.

On what ground do these men defend a thesis which Fr. Pope feels to be invidious, and which to common sense seems simply absurd? Until recently, Mr. Belloc had not so much defended it as continued to reassert it; he writes habitually for readers for whom half-a-dozen confident repetitions, coupled with accusations of ignorance against all non-Romanists, are as good as documentary proof. But, in *The Universe* for June 14th, 1929, and under criticism from Mr. J. W. Poynter in *The Merthyr Express* for August 3rd, he developed his ideas in detail, summing them up in a single sentence; "the theory of history which I advance—to wit, that true history is history written in consonance with Catholic philosophy." "The whole question," he says again, "resolves itself into the simple proposition—whether the Catholic claim is true or false." Yet for the truth of what he calls "the Catholic claim" he advances practically no evidence beyond that characteristic piece of Romanist jugglery which substitutes a word for facts. He writes: "I will not take up any of your space by insisting on [Mr. Poynter's] curious insistence on the term 'Roman' Catholic (as though there were three hundred different kinds of Catholics, Mormon Catholics, Mohammedan Catholics, the Seventh Day Monarchy Catholics, and rigidly Agnostic Catholics) but deal with the main issue." In the *Atlantic Monthly* for March, 1930, again, he asserts that *Roman Catholic* is "a provincial legal term invented for political purposes by Westminster Crown lawyers of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century . . . to say it is meaningless or opprobrious. It was invented to be used in England as a protest that the Church of England could be Catholic without the Pope." The fact is, that "Roman Catholic" was a term used by orthodox subjects of the Pope, without distinction of country, during the Middle Ages; and it throws a curious light on Mr.

---

[18] *Europe and the Faith,* introduction.

Belloc's pretensions as a mediæval historian that he should ignore this elementary truth. Still more startling is his ignorance of present-day practice in his own church. I need only quote from three of the latest among pronouncements of the Roman Curia during the last twelvemonth. Pius XI., in his Encyclical on Education (Dec. 31st, 1929), writes solemnly of "The Holy Roman Catholic Church." And this same "meaningless or opprobrious" term is used, with equal solemnity, by Cardinal Merry del Val in his preface to the Pope's new *Index Librorum Prohibitorum.* Most striking of all, Cardinal Gasparri actually makes it into one of the gravest accusations against the Roman Catholic Prime Minister of Malta, Lord Strickland, that he should have preferred the disgusting and offensive abbreviation *Catholic* to the full style of *Roman Catholic* used by the Papal Court. "He exerted himself," writes the indignant Cardinal, "in every way to violate article one of the Constitution of Malta, which reads: 'The religion of Malta is the Roman Catholic Apostolic Religion,' proposing that the word '*Roman*' should be suppressed. Thus it was evident he could only disgust and offend the Catholics, for whom the word 'Roman' was precisely the expression which distinguished the Catholic religion from all other Christian confessions."[14] The man who does not know, or who disguises, the fact that "Roman Catholic" was a common term among orthodox Papalists in the Middle Ages, and that it is official at Rome to the present day, is a wrong-headed historian, whether he professes to write under the inspiration of Catholic or of Mohammedan philosophy. He not only makes a serious mis-statement of fact, but he misses much of the significance of Church history. Mr. Poynter had no difficulty in reducing Mr. Belloc to silence; he needed only to point out that all Mr. Belloc's philosophy rests upon blustering self-assertion, and upon ignorance of the history of Romanist thought from Aquinas onwards. The same comedy was repeated in *The Listener* for Nov. 27th, 1929, etc. Here Mr. Belloc again enunciated his theory; Mr. Poynter again pointed out that, if no history is trustworthy but that which is dominated by a true philosophy, then no history will ever be worth serious consideration so long as mankind is still undecided between different philosophies. Here, again, Mr. Belloc attempted no further explanation.

---

[14] *Blue Book on Maltese Affairs,* 1930, p. 48.

For, in fact, what the Romanist claims as his own superior sense of history is often nothing more than a lively sense of present-day controversial necessities, working freely because it is untrammelled by any thorough knowledge even of the Romanist past, let alone the whole past in general. Loisy had reason to quote Gabriel Monod's verdict on his own book; that it followed an idea of development of the Church in history which " at bottom, is really Catholic; but since the Council of Trent, and, especially, the Vatican Council, the Church has lost all sense of history, even of her own history, although the Church's very *raison d'être* is that of historical evolution."[15]

We have, as it happens, a comparatively recent incident which supplies an admirable test for this theory of the infallibility of Romanist history, as based upon an infallible philosophy. Memory is short, especially for inconvenient facts, and Messrs. Belloc and Pope can count upon complete ignorance, among their own chosen public, of the fact that, nearly all the historians in the world, in 1870, were against that Decree which, in the name of " Catholic Philosophy " imposed Papal Infallibility upon the faithful. Döllinger, Lord Acton, Hefele, sincere Catholics all, formed a trio of historians which has not since been equalled in their Church; yet the first of these submitted to actual excommunication, the second faced every risk of it, and the third held out until it was evident that submission alone could save him from

[15] *Autour d'un Petit Livre,* p. 302.

Döllinger's fate. Alzog, perhaps the best of the historians of the second rank, was against the Infallibility Decree; so were practically all the historians at Munich and at Bonn, several of whom formally seceded from Rome on that account. That which has brought modern Romanist historians into line with the Decree is not Catholic Philosophy, but simply the Discipline of the Sergeant-Major. It is notorious that men like Duchesne have never accepted it except in a Pickwickian sense.

Still, the Romanist public knows nothing of these things, though they are only of yesterday; therefore, the present-day apologist can safely ignore nearly all the most pertinent facts. He knows perfectly well that not one in a thousand, among his ordinary readers, has the will or the opportunity to spend a little time and a certain amount of independent thought upon the actual documents of 1870. So far, he is safe. But, as I have said, there is one far more recent incident which is almost equally instructive, and which cannot be explained away by such sophisms as have been applied to the Infallibility question. This is the case of Léo Taxil and Diana Vaughan.

CHAPTER XV.

A GIGANTIC FRAUD.

"My worthy superior [of the Grand Seminary] (writes Houtin, on p. 83 of *The Life of a Priest*) was one of the earliest and most confirmed victims of Léo Taxil's mystification. He would tell his pupils, at their devotional meetings, that the devil presided in person over the meetings of the Freemasons. My Catholic faith in the devil was perfectly sound—at Solesmes I had even known a monk who was possessed by him—but I believed that at the present day the devil's chief skill lay in concealing himself, even in making people deny him, so that had he appeared in a lodge all the Freemasons would have been converted to worship the good God. Thus it seemed to me that Freemasons were grossly misjudged, especially as I happened to know some who were excellent people." And again, on p. 116 of his *Crise du Clergé,* he tells us that such seminarists as were seriously interested in social questions often read a certain *Manuel Social Chrétien* which quoted as authorities the works of Léo Taxil and the pseudo-doctor Bataille.

Loisy, again, had occasion to contrast the disfavour of his own *Gospel and the Church,* in high quarters, with the favours lavished on certain impostors. He wrote (*Autour d'un Petit Livre,* p. xxix.): "It is not very long since a vulgar journalist, who wanted to take the measure of Catholic credulity, entertained the clergy and the faithful, year after year, with stupid and ridiculous fictions. The hoax lasted as long as the hoaxer pleased to keep it up. This propaganda of lies and craziness was able to grow up and flourish without one single word of disapproval uttered publicly by the bishops of France. The flock of the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, who are forbidden to read my *Gospel and the Church*, have always been, and still are, authorised to edify themselves among the Catholic writings of Léo Taxil. It might perhaps be opportune not to suggest too clearly that it is permissible to exploit the ignorance and fanaticism of the mass of believers, but that it is not permissible to remedy this; and that a little frank knowledge makes a man more noxious to present-day Catholicism than the most unbridled audacity in invention of unhealthy dreams." The story of this journalist, and of his almost incredible impostures, was well known a few years ago, but is beginning to pass into oblivion. It has been clearly told, however, by the eminent American historian H. C. Lea, in a pamphlet difficult to procure in the original, but still available in an excellent French version at about sixpence—*Léo Taxil, Diana Vaughan et l'Eglise Romaine* (Paris, 17 rue Cujas, 1901).

It may not unfairly be said that the Roman Church, in the collective sense, is mainly responsible for this base affair. For we rightly hold an army responsible for what it does, though no command may have come from headquarters; responsible, also, to some real extent, even though some superior officer here and there may have protested against it. And in this case, as we shall see, not only did Roman Catholics as a body show themselves favourable to what has proved to be a tissue of lies, but such guidance as came from headquarters was calculated rather to fan the flame than to quench it.

I have briefly told the rise of Freemasonry as a modern secret society, in my book on *Art and the Reformation.* In Britain, where it originated early in the eighteenth century, the Government has troubled little about it, therefore, it has had a perfectly natural development; ecclesiastics, and even Roman Catholics, have sometimes been among its highest members. On the Continent, to which it soon spread, its earliest activities were in favour of the exiled Stuarts and against the Hanoverian line. But the Roman Church has pretensions which made it impossible for Popes to treat this society with the easy British tolerance; and in 1738, the Order was solemnly condemned by Clement XII., as a secret society in which men of all religions might meet; therefore, all Freemasons were condemned as "vehemently suspected of heresy"; bishops were to search them out and punish them; and the Freemason incurred *ipso facto* excommunication, from which the Pope alone could absolve him. The Paris *Parlement* refused to recognise this bull; but, in Spain, Freemasons and even their abettors were liable to the death penalty, though the only actual execution recorded is that of a Frenchman who had written a book on Freemasonry. Continental Masonry, therefore, became naturally an anti-clerical institution, more and more definitely opposed to Papal policy. For, in 1751, Benedict XIV. confirmed the bull of Clement XII.; Pius VII., Leo XII., Pius VIII. and Pius IX. repeated the condemnations. This last, in 1865, attributed to Freemasonry the wars and seditions which had upset Europe and done so much harm to the Church; and in a brief of July 14th, 1873, he attributed the foundation of the sect to Satan; no other could have invented an institution so impious. The head Lodge at Paris presently took an equally decided step on their own side; they made it no longer essential for the Mason to declare belief in God and in Immortality; the American Grand Master, and the Prince of Wales, formally dissociated themselves from this, and the British Lodges, I believe, no longer recognise those of the Continent. Leo XIII., in 1884, condemned the whole Order again without distinction; mankind, he wrote, is divided into two camps; we must serve God or the Devil, and Freemasonry is on the Devil's side. Let all bishops, therefore, leave no effort untried to unmask and punish these devilish ministers who are striving to rehabilitate ancient Paganism.

When a Pope speaks so deliberately and emphatically, in a public pronouncement which bears so many of the characters of Infallibility, a great impulse is naturally given to the Roman Church in general. Henceforward, any loyal subject who has not hitherto credited Freemasonry with direct Satanic inspiration, must feel uncomfortable in his conscience until he has reconciled it with the papal view. Leo gave the cue to several sincere fanatics, including the Bishop of Grenoble and a Jesuit Archbishop, Meurin, who welcomed the Papal action with exalted enthusiasm. He wrote: "Fortunately, the true Jerusalem, which is come down from heaven, is still effectively guarded by Him who governs her in the name of the Divine King. . . . Among the numerous and pressing exhortations pronounced by Popes from their height in the Throne of St. Peter, there shines like a light from heaven *(lumen de coelo)* the marvellous Encyclical *Humanum Genus,* published by our reigning Pontiff, Leo XIII. That is the lance-thrust of St. George into the heart of the Dragon of Hell."[1] Meurin, like Bishop Fava, entered into details. He described the Freemasons as Luciferians, who modelled all their anti-religious rites upon parodies of those of the Church. Meurin represented Charleston as the Devil's Rome; the place where he appears to his adherents and gives them his commands. Not a word of these absurdities was condemned; why should they be, when Rome herself had suggested them? To write and think in this way was to be in the Movement; there might be exaggerations, but these were all in favour of the Truth!

Presently, however, an adventurer realised what profit he might make out of a public which swallowed these things and gaped for more. This was the man who wrote under the name of Léo Taxil; Gabriel Jogand-Pagès, born at Marseilles in 1854, and, therefore, not only a compatriot but a contemporary of the still more famous Tartarin de Tarascon. Educated partly by Jesuits, he took early to journalism, and distinguished himself by violent irreligion and libellous personalities. In 1876, he fled to Geneva to avoid imprisonment for libel; in 1879 he returned to Paris and was several times condemned for the same offence; for his *Secret Amours of Pius IX.* he was fined 60,000 francs. He founded a secularist bookshop, and a daily, *The Anti-Clerical,* through which he raised 17,000 members for his "League of Freethinkers." But his mind was as fertile as it was reckless; and Leo XIII's Encyclical suggested to him that more money might be made on that side than by exploiting or fabricating papal scandals. A year after the Encyclical, it was suddenly announced that this prince of Freethinkers had been converted. He shut up his shop, destroyed his books, and was absolved by the Papal Nuncio in Paris from his numerous excommunications. Though he had been only one year among the Freemasons, and never risen beyond the apprenticeship, he made a rapid fortune with a series of writings under the general title of *Complete Revelations concerning Freemasonry.* His main theme was that it was a survival of mediæval Manichæism, and a deliberate worship of Satan. He invented documents, invented rituals, and even invented a whole volume on Woman in Freemasonry, unhindered by the notorious fact that it admits no women. Father Grüber, S.J., who translated some of this stuff into German, held up Freemasonry as the natural complement of Luther's work. Dr. Hacks in Germany, and one Margiotta in Italy, took up the same theme; the latter demanded £2,000 for the German translation of his book. When, however, the inspired *Monitore di Roma* reproduced his description of secret Masonic bestialities, Monsignor Vöglein had to pay a heavy fine for libel. The absurdities culled by Lea from Margiotta's book almost exceed belief; yet he was welcomed in public pronouncements by at least eight Bishops and Archbishops; the Pope conferred on him the Order of the

---

[1] Meurin, *Franc-maçonnerie,* Paris, 1893, p. 469

Holy Sepulchre. The whole movement was still further stimulated by Leo XIII., who, though he was an excellent classical scholar, and was often extolled as a man of great learning, was capable of very great lapses. Between 1890 and 1892, he published three official proclamations in encouragement of Taxil and his fellows.

The result was natural; few frankly fictitious novels have sold so well as Taxil's so-called histories. His first book under his new "Catholic" rôle was *Frère Trois-Points,* which, (as the Jesuit Grüber admits in his semi-apologetic volume after the exposure) contains the gist of the rest, and may therefore fairly be taken as typical.[2] The book begins by quoting from Leo XIII.; it claims the support of the Bishop of Grenoble (who, after the exposure, confessed his complete credulity), and 100,000 copies were sold in France alone. A German and a Swiss Romanist printing firm joined to produce a German version by (as they advertised) a trustworthy Jesuit Father. The Jesuit *Civiltà Cattolica,* which, more than any other organ, is generally believed to express the mind of the Vatican, spoke of "the beautiful pages of Léo Taxil, and the best Italian translation, with useful notes by Luigi Matteucchi." The main Jesuit organ of Germany, *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach,* devoted nearly five close-printed 8vo. pages to it, by Fr. H. Grüber, S.J., who was probably himself the translator. This laudatory Jesuit Review says: "This German edition contains a specially rich collection of documents, often quite new, by which we may judge Freemasonry." After describing this as a work which the Freemasons cannot confute, he adds: "It seems admirably designed to realise that so often and so earnestly expressed wish of our Holy Father [Leo XIII.], that Freemasonry should be unmasked." (Feb., 1888, pp. 229ff.) It will be enough to quote as specimens of the rest, extracts from the six next Roman Catholic puffs, taken in the order in which they were given by the publishers' prospectus of this translation :—

---

[2] See P. Braeunlich, *Der Neueste Teufelsschwindel,* Leipzig, 1897, pp. 16, 17.

Kölnische Volkszeitung. (" Greatest and fullest Catholic journal in Germany, circulation of 13,500.")

" If anyone knows French Freemasonry, that man is Taxil. This book speaks out in the freest fashion concerning the dangerous aims of the Lodges."

Germania (Berlin).

" For us, also, Taxil's revelations are of great value. This translation forms a welcome complement to Pachtler's well known and valuable work on Freemasonry."

Schlesische Volkszeitung. (" Greatest and most important Catholic journal in Eastern Germany, circulation 5,200.")

" Léo Taxil has made revelations concerning Freemasonry in a book which has attracted much attention, and of which 22,000 copies were sold in five months. The organs of French Freemasonry have not even attempted to contest his statements; that is certainly the fullest proof of their complete trustworthiness."

Stadt Gottes (circulation 40,000).

" It cannot be doubted that this model translation into German will have a wide circulation. Those who wish to learn more of the spiritual currents which influence the present day, will find in this most interesting work a proper guide and numerous revelations."

Ingolstädter Zeitung (3,800).

" Seldom indeed has any book won for itself such general attention as Léo Taxil's revelations concerning Freemasonry."

Bairische Vaterland.

" The whole Catholic press has spoken out its great gratitude for the deserving and interesting work of the converted Freemason Léo Taxil; and the public has ratified this judgment of the press. An acquaintance with this excellent book is absolutely necessary for the full comprehension of modern times and politics and of the forces which guide them; for it produces only facts and things which can be proved, and avoids all exaggerations."[3]

All this, as we have seen, was greedily swallowed, not only by Fava, Bishop of Grenoble, but also by the Jesuit Meurin, Archbishop of Bombay. Taxil fooled these men, and the clergy in general, to the top of their bent. In his *Frère Trois-Points* (Vol. II., p. 316) he wrote: "I will reproduce here the actual words of the last and greatest invocation of the Spirit of Darkness" [at solemn Masonic meetings. This begins:—]

"Hémen-Etan! . . . Hémen-Etan!
Hémen-Etan . . . El Ati! . . .
Titeip! . . . Azia! . . . Hin! Teu!
Minosel . . . Achadon! . . . Vaï! vaa!
Eyé . . . Aaa! Eyé! Exe! . . . A! . . .
El! . . . El! . . . El! . . . A! . . .
Hy! . . . Hau! . . . Hau! . . . Hau!"

Upon this, Father Meurin, who piqued himself on Hebrew scholarship, wrote a learned commentary, which may be found on p. 212 of his book *La Franc-maçonnerie* (1893). "The text of these evocations," he says, "contains principally the name of God under different forms: for instance, *El ati,* 'God cometh'; *Eyé* for *Eheye,* 'I am'; *Jé-Jé-Jé—hau-hau-hau—vah-vah-vah,* the name of Jehova thrice in separate syllables; *Khavajoth, Kavajoth, Kavajoth, 'Eves, Eves,'* etc." To this the Archbishop adds that we have here, with other circumstances, "sufficient indications that Freemasonry, in certain grades of its back-Lodges, is openly addicted to the practices of diabolic magic." And all the following pages of "proof" swarm with quotations from Léo Taxil. Moreover, Taxil himself added as a note to the gibberish of his own text "The reader may see from this what strong reasons Mgr. Fava has for asserting that actual invocations of the Devil may be heard in Freemasons' Lodges."

---

[3] All these, and much more, may be found in Braeunlich, pp. 24ff.

Meanwhile, the fabrications developed in two important directions. One concerned the *Palladium*, or Secret Central Committee of Masonry, at whose *Triangles*, or solemn meetings, the Devil regularly appeared in person. The second and still bolder lie was that of Diana Vaughan.

The poet, Henry Vaughan (Silurist), had, it appears, a twin brother, Commander of the Rosy Cross, who devoted himself to the destruction of the Papacy. Having made a pact with Satan which assured him thirty-three more years of life for this task, he crossed the Atlantic, lived among the Red Indians, and was there visited by the Pagan goddess Astarte, by whom he had a daughter. On his return to England in 1648 he left her among the Indians, where she married the Great Chief and had a son. This child, in 1675, was miraculously transported for a few hours to visit his grandfather at Hamburg, and then back again to the Indians. Diana Vaughan was this boy's direct descendant. Her father was an American Mason who had founded a Grand Triangle; in 1884 she was initiated into the most secret rites; and, either then or earlier, she was betrothed to the great demon Asmodeus, to whom she was officially presented at a secret meeting (Charleston, 1889), at which she was consecrated High Priestess of Lucifer. To increase the interest of this farce, a rival High Priestess was invented in Sophia Walder, putative daughter of a Lutheran Pastor who was a Freemason, but really begotten of his wife or mistress, Ida Jacobsen, by commerce with Lucifer. This sacred origin was the earnest of a still more distinguished future: in 1929 Sophia Walder would have a daughter at Jerusalem by the demon Bitru; and in 1962 (all these are intervals of thirty-three years) this daughter, by the demon Decarabia, would give birth to Antichrist. Sophia and Diana naturally quarrelled: here comes in the old story of spitting on a consecrated Host and stabbing it with a dagger. Diana now founded the sect of

Independent and Regenerated Luciferians, and published (that is, Taxil published in her name) three numbers of a monthly journal, *The Free and Regenerated Palladium, directed by Miss Diana Vaughan.* These proclaimed the doctrines of the sect, and were full of the nonsense which, as he knew, the faithful wished to attribute to Freemasonry. Christ and the Virgin Mary are demons in rebellion against Lucifer; in 1895, Antichrist will show himself; the then Pope, a converted Jew, will abandon Christianity for Luciferianism; a year of fierce warfare will exterminate all Catholics; and the spirits rebellious to Lucifer will be banished by him to Saturn, where they will dwell to eternity under guard of the Spirits of Light—i.e. the rings which we see surrounding that planet.

After three numbers, this journal gave place to *Diana Vaughan, Memoirs of an ex-Palladist.* Diana, like Taxil, had now been converted. This had brought her a visit from the heathen gods Beelzebub, Astarte, Moloch and Asmodeus, in all their princely glory, who threatened her for having ceased to speak ill of the Virgin Mary; she then called for aid to Joan of Arc, whereupon they took their proper hideous form—horns, tails, etc.—and vanished howling. Now, therefore, Diana intends to seal her conversion by writing her autobiography. She was hidden in a convent; if once her retreat was discovered, desperate Palladists would make short work of her. From this safe retreat, Taxil poured forth monthly instalments even more remarkable for their absurdity than for their falsity. The English Admiral Markham was even cited as a witness; on March 6th, at Malta, he had expressed incredulity, but had been miraculously transported to a meeting of the Grand Lodge at Charleston, where he saw the demon Baphomet, and was wafted back, a convinced man, to Malta. Diana, in proof of her sincerity, published a book of devotion, *La Neuvaine Eucharistique,* and sent a copy to Leo XIII. The Pope, through his Cardinal Vicar, Parocchi, sent her his special blessing: her conversion is a triumph of grace; he himself is now reading her *Memoirs* with breathless interest. Thus encouraged, "she" published another volume of 500 pages, on Italian Masonry, receipt of which was acknowledged by one of the Papal secretaries, who exhorted her to continue a work for which Providence had designed her, and only wished she would deal now with the false reports which were beginning to be circulated about herself. For, by this time, Margiotta and Hacks were quarrelling with Taxil for their share of the spoil. Yet even towards the end of the year (Sept., 1896) the Jesuit *Civiltà Cattolica* (the *Times* of Romanism) spoke of Diana as the natural butt for Masonic lies and fabrications, since she had been "called from the depth of darkness to God's light, prepared by God's Providence and armed with personal knowledge and experience, employing herself in the Service of the Church, and indefatigable in her precious publications, unequalled in accuracy and in usefulness." About the same time, the director of the great Jesuit School at Feldkirch, Father Künzle, in his Eucharistic journal *Pelikan,* insisted that there was nothing improbable in the Vaughan story. This is tacitly admitted by Fr. Grüber (*Betrug als Ende eines Betruges,* Berlin, 1897, p. 54).

So great had been the impression in orthodox circles, that a great Anti-masonic Congress had been arranged at Trent for the end of September. The Honorary President was the Prince-Bishop of Trent; the Chairman was Prince v. Löwenstein; nearly 1,000 members attended, including 36 bishops in person and about 50 more by proxy. Leo XIII. blessed it by telegram; the Congress decided unanimously that Freemasonry recognises Lucifer as its God. Léo Taxil was authorised to organise an Anti-masonic League. Then four Germans openly expressed doubts as to Diana Vaughan; a special meeting was held on this question (Sept. 29th). Taxil invoked the danger for Diana's life; but he would produce proofs privately to a Bishop selected by the Congress. It was only months later that this prelate spoke out, accusing Taxil of having produced no serious evidence during this private interview; and Taxil then gave him flatly the lie. A Commission of Investigation, appointed by the Congress, remained silent; now, therefore, even orthodox Romanist papers began to denounce the fraud. But nothing is so difficult for the Vatican as a public confession; and, as late as Oct. 16th, a Domestic Chaplain of Leo XIII., Secretary to Cardinal Parocchi, wrote to Diana; he had proofs of the sincerity of her conversion, and exhorted her to continue her work, which was most profitable against the devices of Satan. At last (Jan., 1897) the commission published its report, but in language so confused as to betray its embarrassment. Meanwhile, Taxil had to contend against a rising tide of criticism in the Church press, though the Bishop of Grenoble and the editor of one diocesan journal still supported him. The game was evidently up now, and he prepared one last hoax: Diana would appear on Easter Monday, April 19th, and deliver, with lantern slides, a lecture which would be repeated through Europe and America. All the principal papers were invited to send reporters; and, in her number of April 14th, Diana published a farrago of greater nonsense than ever; the tail of the Lion of St. Mark had twined affectionately round her neck, and its tuft had turned into the head of Asmodeus, persuading her back to Luciferianism; Diana's uncle had taken a snapshot with his kodak!

On the 19th, the hall was filled with journalists; but umbrellas and sticks were all taken at the door. Taxil mounted the platform, and denounced himself as an infanticide, the murderer of the child of his own brain, Diana Vaughan. His main idea, all through, was to get further insight into the real feelings and motives of the Papal Hierarchy; and here he had succeeded beyond his wildest hopes. The Pope, of course, had been an innocent dupe; but Taxil asserted that the Cardinals and the Court had been less dupes than silent accomplices; the movement, they thought, would help the Church, and was therefore to be encouraged. The howls of his audience left him imperturbable; he went on until the journalists invaded the platform; then the police helped him to slip into a café, and the farce was played out.

Yet, as Lea points out, these lies have never been put upon the Index. "At this moment, among the works forbidden by the Roman Church, we may find Sabatier's amiable *Life of St. Francis* and Taine's *History of English Literature;* but the names of Taxil, Bataille, [Hacks] Margiotta and Diana Vaughan are conspicuous by their absence. Therefore the faithful are still justified in seeking, from these edifying authorities, information as to the mysteries of Freemasonry." We may say more than this; we may say that, if the Roman Church were to put all false teaching concerning the Freemasons on the Index, it would have to begin by pillorying, *donec corrigatur,* Leo XIII's own Encyclical of April 20th, 1884, which has been broadcast in an authorised English translation (Burns & Oates, 1884, price 2d.).

Demand creates supply; and, if Taxil saw a lucrative job here, it was because he knew he had to deal with a rich and powerful association, wedded to certain falsehoods, and ready to pay for anything which should seem to confirm them. If he exploited this mine with an open-faced audacity which would scarcely appear plausible even in a cinema-film, it was because he reckoned, by experience, upon a total lack of historical sense among nine-tenths of the Romanists in France, and upon the supineness or cowardice of the less unhistorically-minded minority. He knew that they believed, with Mr. Belloc and Fr. Pope, that a Roman Catholic must be right in every historical question, and his opponents must be wrong. He exploited this foible with consummate audacity, and, for a time, with this astounding success.

For here he was in the full current, not indeed of Catholic, but of Romanist tradition. Those pious purveyors of historical falsehood whom we have seen branded by the indignant Bishop Cano were men inspired by the Romanist philosophy of their day; indeed, in some cases, they were far more familiar with it than these modern writers who boast it most blatantly. It was that philosophy which inspired the historian of the Patriarchs of Ravenna to compose certain biographies, not from documents or even from oral tradition, but " by the help of God and with the prayers of the brethren." It was that which inspired Jacobus de Varagine in his *Golden Legend;* and, again, that pious nun who imagined a whole life-story for the non-existent Saint Philumena,[4] and the authors of a hundred other legends which genuine Catholic philosophers regard as sceptically nowadays as the most unsympathetic outsider does. It is almost as true now as it was 800 years ago, when the pious Abbot Guibert de Nogent complained of it, that any ignorant scribbler can be sure of a welcome in Romanism, so long as he writes " edifying " history.

No less significant was the welcome given by the French clergy, and nearly all practising Catholics in France, to the Dreyfus fraud. The protest against these cruel lies, the appeal to actual evidence, and the decision that this evidence proved Dreyfus' innocence, was confined almost entirely to Protestants, Jews and Free-thinkers. Indeed, it was the main boast of French Catholicism that this was so; a boast which has scarcely died out even now, when nearly all the world knows the truth. Mr. Belloc, to quote a prominent instance, is often mentioned as having gained one of his greatest oratorical successes by his insistence at an Oxford debate upon the Jew's guilt, and by the quasi-religious tone which he gave to his speech. It was only a handful of practising Catholics in France who dared to demand fair play, and to join, on that one point, the hated crew of "Dreyfusards." A distinguished Paris professor enumerates, in answer to my enquiries on this point, only three of his colleagues of the first rank who stood up publicly for Dreyfus. Gaston Paris and Paul Meyer were Catholics by tradition, but neither practising nor believing; moreover, they were rather philologists than historians. Paul Viollet, on the other hand, was a faithful and practising Catholic; but he proved too liberal for the hierarchy, and his later book on the *Syllabus,* hailed by his own party as a masterpiece of enlightened Catholic apologetics, and approved publicly by the Bishop of Besançon, was put upon the Index of 1906. The most outspoken and persistent Dreyfusard among historians was a liberal Protestant, Gabriel Monod. In this connection, my correspondent notes the fact that French Protestantism was divided on this subject; the Liberals (mostly Calvinists) defended Dreyfus while the Conservatives (mostly Lutherans) attacked him. But Rome was practically undivided; Mr. Stillman wrote in 1899, from a long experience of politics in that city which few outsiders have equalled, "It is the Vatican which fosters the scandal and monstrous wrong of the Dreyfus infamies, for which it makes the Catholic Church directly responsible."[5]

---

[4] For this whole story, see Salmon, p. 197.

Shortly afterwards, Léon Chaine, reminding his readers of the grotesque legends which were current in Catholic circles about the Dreyfus affair and Léo Taxil and Diana Vaughan, added: "This gives us the right of wondering whether we ought not to introduce some reforms into the methods of education and teaching which have proved so ineffective that minds which have been moulded by them are still so devoid of critical sense, and present a spectacle so lamentable and humiliating for human reason."[6] In 1901, he wrote his *Letter of a Lyonnais Catholic to a Bishop on the Dreyfus Affair;* but he sought vainly for any Roman Catholic journal that would publish it; only after sixteen months was he able to get it into Abbé Naudet's *Justice Sociale.*[7] "As soon as it appeared," (wrote a reviewer) "the letter brought cards and compliments from several prelates. M. Chaine, in spite of his wishes, is only half deceived as to the meaning of this shower of episcopal holy-water. In order to open his eyes, Cardinal Lecot, Archbishop of Bordeaux, took care to show him, in a civil letter, that it is convenient to mind one's own business. But Catholics who were not bound to reticence and discretion were more plain-spoken. . . . We shall perhaps be brought to see a peculiar kind of Catholic in M. Chaine. As I said to begin with, I knew one other already; that makes two; I imagine that a good many folk have not so many among their acquaintance. . . . The editor of *La Vérité Française* [an Ultramontane organ] reminded M. Chaine that 'association with Dreyfusards is not the best way of penetrating oneself with the spirit of the Church.' The truth is that, when the crisis was at its fiercest, the voice of the Father of the Faithful remained dumb. When the condemned man's wife raised her suppliant prayer to Leo XIII., the Head of the Church never realised how noble a gesture it would be to move in favour of this son of the reprobate race. He ignored, also, (more astonishing still!) how politic such a gesture would be."[8] And Chaine, in his text, quotes the exact words of *La Vérité Française,* which shares with *L'Univers* the primacy in French Romanist journalism.

---

[5] *National Review,* May, 1899, p. 398; the whole article is of great value. Mr. Stillman was U.S.A. Consul, and a sort of informal diplomatic Minister in Rome from 1874 onwards; he had thus four years even under Pius IX.

---

[6] Chaine, p. 80. Compare the whole of his tenth chapter: *The Intellectual Timidity of Certain Catholics.*

[7] A "Christian Socialist" paper, which was condemned by two Bishops in 1908 and suppressed a few weeks later by a decree of the Inquisition. Naudet was forbidden by the same decree "to publish these journals, or any other, or any other writings of the same kind, whether under his own or any other name, under pain of *ipso facto* 'suspensio a divinis.'" (Houtin, *Mod. Cath.*, p. 205.)

"A Dreyfusard Catholic—this Catholic, of a sort which, thank God! is rare, sends us the following letter." And at the end he added the comment "We have no intention of discussing the affair. The Catholic mind, God be thanked! has long been made up."[9]

To this terrible want of ordinary common sense and compromise in the Romanist mind, and especially to the deliberate fashion in which the clergy are first educated apart from ordinary thought, and then, by habit, keep themselves more and more apart, we must attribute those crude and continual conflicts between clericalism and anti-clericalism which characterise all the Latin nations. Wherever there is no strong leaven of Protestantism—and in pretty strict proportion to the absence of any such leaven—we find the painful phenomenon that it is almost impossible to avoid bitter enmity on one side or the other. In Mexico, if the Roman Catholic newspapers may be trusted, their religion is almost as cruelly persecuted by the now dominant Radicals as it was by Elizabeth after the Pope's Bull of Deposition.[10] Even in France, where there is, perhaps, more of a middle party than in any other Latin country, it has always been difficult to avoid one or other of the extremes. As the *Spectator* put it two generations ago, we Britons may find it difficult to realise the conflict, but then "our controversies [in politics] are so petty in comparison with the immense issues for which Frenchmen are fighting "[11]—on the one hand, clerical supremacy; on the other, personal and political liberty as we here understand them. In a recent co-operative volume, again, on *Labour and the Church,* the Belgian contributor confesses the difficulty of being at the same time a real Catholic and a real Socialist. "The essay contributed by M. Emile Vandervelde, the leader of the Belgian Labour Party, is valuable both for its candour and for its lucid exposition of the situation on the Continent. This writer draws a firm distinction between the attitude of Labour towards religion in England and the Anglo-Saxon countries, and the Latin nations. In England, he says, the programme of labour is exclusively political and economic; while in France, and in a less degree in Belgium, the Socialist Party is composed wholly of men who are indifferent to religion or hostile to it. He recalls a luncheon at which Mr. Henderson presided, and the utter astonishment of the French delegate when the chairman arose to say grace. 'No,' exclaimed the Frenchman, 'this is impossible!' And it seemed for a few moments that he would leave the table. M. Vandervelde considers this anti-clerical attitude to be a great weakness of Continental Socialism. English labour can form a solid *bloc,* and regard religion as a private matter; but on the Continent, we find Christian unions in opposition to the Socialist unions; and large masses of workers, with common economic interests, are debarred from united action because of their religious beliefs."[12]

---

[8] Chaine, pp. 339ff. Compare the speech of the most conspicuous Dominican of that day, Père Didon, cursing all Dreyfusards in the name of religion, *ibid.,* p. 342.

[9] Chaine, pp. 109, 248.

[10] Cardinal Merry del Val's preface to the new Papal Index is very much to the point. The opening sentence characterises modern licence of the press as a diabolical weapon even more dangerous for true religion than fire and sword had been under the pagan persecutions.

Mr. Belloc, in a recent paper published under the auspices of the British Broadcasting Company, emphasised two ideas without apparently realising their intimate connection.[13] On the one hand, Romanists alone are right in their conceptions; they alone can see things as they really are. On the other hand, the

[11] April 17th, 1875, p. 492.

[12] *Church Times,* Dec. 20th, 1929.

[13] *The Listener,* Nov. 27th, 1929.

world is gradually working up for a conflict so desperate between the Faithful and the Faithless that it will be impossible either for Romanism to survive or for non-Romanism; one will exterminate the other. Those two ideas are, it must be repeated, intimately connected; the one follows naturally from the other. If any such Armageddon is ever to come, it can only be through such a growth of Romanism among us as shall reduce us to the irreconcilable antagonisms of South America. If ever that spirit should reign in Britain (except as a brief and passing phase) which made nearly the whole French clergy, and nearly the whole body of professing Catholics, believers in Léo Taxil's accuracy and in Dreyfus' guilt, then no doubt we should have internecine war; and in that case, we could scarcely doubt the final issue. But, here in Britain, the long opposition and inter-communion of different parties, whether political or religious, has bred a spirit of common sense and of mutual understanding which, fortunately, enable us to laugh as quietly at Mr. Belloc's visions of Armageddon as at his conviction that he himself possesses infallible "knowledge," while we possess only "opinions."

P.S.—Fr. Thurston has just published a book called *No Popery*, in which he fleshes his arrows upon a number of anticlerical writers of whom three-quarters are probably unknown even by name to most English readers, and adroitly insinuates that other opponents of his Church are as prejudiced and inaccurate as those obscure persons evidently are. He makes a good deal of this case of Léo Taxil; but adroitly disguises the ecclesiastical welcome given to all these anti-Masonic forgeries; his book should be read as an admirable instance of "economy of truth."

CHAPTER XVI.

THE SLIPPERY SLOPE.

IF falsehood is the natural refuge of the weak, still more natural is it to those who are pledged to a profession of strength and wisdom, yet chained to the crude ideas of an age which cannot return,—unless, indeed, the Barbarian Invasions are ever repeated. We have seen how the forward step of 1870 was really forced upon the Pope, if he was not to take a step backward. He found himself in that position in which Commines describes Louis XI. during his failing years: "He changed officers, disbanded regiments, diminished pensions, or took them clean away, and told me but a few days before his death that he passed away the time in making and undoing men. To be short, he caused himself to be more spoken of within his realm than ever was any King, and all for fear lest men should think him dead." If Pius IX. and his majority cried so loud at the Vatican Council, it was for the same reason; men were beginning to think them dead. Lord Odo Russell, the British Envoy in Rome at that time, who did so much to help the Infallibilists by his conferences with Manning and his secret communications, was not only no believer in Papal Infallibility, as a doctrine, but he was not even a Roman Catholic. Yet his mother was; and from her "he had acquired a more intimate knowledge of Catholicism than falls to the lot of most Protestant statesmen or diplomatists."[1] "His mother being a Catholic" (wrote Manning), "he had an intellectual conception of the Catholic Faith, and maintained most strongly the absolute need of defining the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. He said to me, 'If you do not define it, the doctrinal Authority of the Pope will be weakened in all the world, and a tendency to National churches will follow.'" It was necessary for Pius IX. to "make and undo men," or men would have undone him.

---

[1] Purcell, *Life of Manning,* 1st ed. (1895), Vol. II., p. 433; cf. 455.

Nothing is more intoxicating than autocracy; and no intoxicant produces a stronger reaction on the morrow. The fumes of the mediæval wine were gradually evaporating in 1870; therefore the Pope took another and deeper draught. Its immediate effect was exhilarating; but the fumes will begin to evaporate again; with each generation, the remedy must needs be more desperately exaggerated. In the face of a generation more interested in history, and more patiently studious of history, than any generation before it, the Vatican Council proclaimed perhaps the most patently unhistorical dogma that has ever been promulgated with anything like equal solemnity. Bishops who had hitherto found it incredible managed now to persuade the public, and perhaps even persuaded themselves, that the thing was credible after all. Others, again, so evacuated it of sense by their apologetic explanations, as to render it practically inoperative.[2] But the vast majority of the faithful must either accept it as the astounding reality that it professes to be, and must therefore take for granted that there were cogent reasons for it, or else they will cease to believe in it; and then politicians of the Odo Russell type will again suggest that, if Papal autocracy is to be maintained—if the Roman Church cannot be content with real Catholicism, but must needs be Romanist also—something more will have to be done to check the tendency towards national churches.[3] There lies the mortal weakness of Rome; and this it is which drives her, more than any other Church that has ever existed, into falsehood. Not merely into error, which is common enough everywhere, but into such unveracity as made Gratry plead with the Bishops, shortly before the Vatican Council, " Hath God need of your lies? "

---

[2] I recently heard a Continental Catholic say to an interlocutor who quoted the Infallibility Decree: "Oh, that doesn't signify."

[3] I am told that this tendency is already growing in Czecho-Slovakia, and that one of the symptoms is an increasing demand for the marriage of the clergy.

I use this word *unveracity* deliberately, and with a full sense of responsibility. In support of an accusation of this kind, clear and cogent evidence must be given; this I try to supply in this and the next chapter, and in the relevant portions of my Appendix. The instances there adduced, from other witnesses and from my own experience, seem to me conclusive as to the step beyond mere *untruth* into actual *untruthfulness.* The persons accused, it will be seen, are all conspicuous for rank or reputation; and I cannot believe that any similar catena of evidence could be brought against men of corresponding station in the non-Romanist religious world. Those Romanist authors who are ready to assert, with Newman, that Protestantism is founded on lies, steadily avoid coming to close quarters. Like Shimei, they curse and cast stones and dust at us from their own hill-side, and with the same practical effect. Mr. Purcell, when he writes of Döllinger, Friedrich and Acton as " men who distorted historical facts, who fabricated fables to the dishonour of the Papacy," offers no evidence, and is, in fact, only repeating a convenient Romanist cliché. Abbot Chapman of Downside, as will presently be seen, was writing equally at random when he made similar accusations in discussion with Bishop Gore.

The reason is simple; all religions except Romanism can afford to admit error. Foxe, the martyrologist, is often quoted as a purveyor of mis-statements; yet he compares very favourably with contemporaries of equal standing on the other side; the greater number of his distortions of truth are omissions and not fabrications. Moreover, the severest exposures of his methods have been by his fellow-Anglicans, especially by S. R. Maitland. Froude, again, is far from accurate and impartial; yet, here again, his most formidable critics have been in the Anglican camp; and his faults were so little voluntary that he had the courage to deposit his transcripts from the Spanish archives in the British Museum, where anyone may check his methods; an action which, I believe, no Romanist historian has ever dared to forestall or to imitate. The English newspapers accept articles or protests from Romanists with a freedom which no Spanish paper would dream of extending to Protestants. No solemn pronouncement of the Anglican Church or of the Greek Church could be characterised as the modern claims to Papal autocracy were described, perhaps by Lord Acton himself, and certainly with his general approval, in *The North British Review* for Oct., 1869, p. 130: " The passage from the Catholicism of the Fathers to that of the modern Popes was accomplished by wilful falsehood; and the whole structure of traditions, laws and doctrines that support the theory of Infallibility, and the practical despotism of the Popes, stands on a basis of fraud."

Modern Roman claims rest mainly on mediæval records; yet it is now admitted by historians of all schools that mediæval standards of literary honesty were such as, in the present day, would seem simply barbarous. What drove Houtin out of the Roman Church was his discovery that ancient falsehood met him everywhere in his researches, and that the modern hierarchy not only condoned these falsehoods, but actually throve upon them and defended them through policy when conviction was dead. He writes: " As a matter of fact, according to unimpeachable evidence, it really seems that there was scarcely any abbey of ancient foundation, and scarcely any ecclesiastical province, in which men have not committed what we, nowadays, should call forgeries. . . . These mediæval proceedings need not astonish anybody who knows anything of mediæval history. But, at the beginning of modern times, this question of forgers is complicated by a little problem. How comes it that, after Protestants had declaimed so loudly against Catholic trickeries and impostures, Catholics could still be found who, for popular edification, have forged and circulated documents that were plainly false? In the early sixteenth century, a Toledo Jesuit, Fr. de La Higuera, sent out copies of historical chronicles which were entirely invented. A little later, in 1630, the Jesuit, Melchior Inchofer, in order to revive the piety of the people of Messina, published a fairly extensive book on a pretended letter written in Hebrew to their ancestors by the Blessed Virgin, and on St. Paul's landing and preaching at Messina. It is possible to plead for the good faith of Inchofer—and even of La Higuera, if you will—and to credit them with a simplicity which is belied by their lives and their works; but that would not enable us to escape from the conclusion that these chronicles, and this letter of the Virgin, are, after all, the work of ecclesiastical forgers."[4]

Popes have led the way with historical falsehoods which, if they have not published themselves, they have allowed to be published in their name, or have adopted from other writers to suit their own convenience. We need not embark upon the uncertain enquiry into their motives; the certainty is that, however unintentionally, they have been among the most prominent misleaders of the public. Their adoption of the Forged Donation of Constantine, and of the False Decretals, will occur to every reader's mind. But, what is not equally well known, Gregory II. is committed to the astounding statement that the Apostles were image-worshippers.[5]

[4] Houtin, *Apostolicité,* p. 140.

[5] See his letter in Migne, *Pat. Lat.,* Vol. LXXXIX., col. 514 c. Attempts are sometimes made to plead that we must not blame the Pope here, but only his chancery. Yet we have a right to take for granted that Gregory had read and approved.

The first papally-authorised edition of the Bible, published by Sixtus V. in 1590 under anathema to all who should use any other, was found to be so grossly incorrect that the Blessed Robert Bellarmine needed all his learning and all his diplomacy to save his Church from public derision. Two years later, Clement VIII. published, under similar anathema, a new revision which differed in more than 3,000 places from the Sixtine Bible. Again, Alfonso de Castro, one of the great anti-Lutheran writers of the sixteenth century, arguing that Popes may err in matters of faith, writes thus: "For I do not think there is any man so impudent in his flattery of the Pope as to attribute to him the impossibility of erring or being deceived in his interpretation of Holy Scripture. For, since it is well known that many [*plures*] of them have been so illiterate as to be utterly ignorant of grammar [i.e. of ordinary Latin], how should they be able to interpret Holy Scripture?"[6] Moreover, even of great Popes it might sometimes be said as of Leo XIII.: "He was learned, but grossly ignorant. The most complex questions, he believed, could be settled by an Encyclical." Leo was the great champion, among modern Popes, of St. Thomas Aquinas; yet we find him ignoring one of the most famous pronouncements of the man whom we may almost call his patron Saint. In his famous Encyclical *Immortale Dei,* and in a passage which a correspondent to *The Times* lately quoted as final on the question of Roman Catholic policy towards non-Romanists (Nov. 8th, 1929), Leo writes: "And in fact the [Roman Catholic] Church is wont to take earnest heed that no one shall be forced to embrace the Catholic Faith against his will: for, as St. Augustine wisely reminds us, 'Man cannot believe otherwise than of his own free will.'" Yet, in the first place, it is notorious that the Roman Church has constantly employed fire and sword to ensure conformity; and, secondly, the appeal to St. Augustine is, if possible, falser still. For, though that particular passage is correctly quoted, yet St. Augustine repeatedly and emphatically recanted the sentiment in his ninety-third Epistle *(Ad Vincentium)* and upon this recantation a most important argument is built in one of the best-known passages of the *Summa Theologiae* (2a 2æ quæst X. art. viii.). To choose only the single passage which St. Thomas cites, St. Augustine writes in that Epistle: "It was my first opinion that no man should be forced into the unity of Christ; that we must work with words and fight by disputation. But this opinion of mine is now overcome not by words of my contradictors but by demonstrative example. For the terror of the [penal] laws [against the Donatist heresy] has been of such profit, that many now say: 'Thanks be to God who hath broken our chains.'" It is well known, also, how Augustine quoted against the Donatists *Coge intrare* from Luke xiv. 23; an incident upon which Pierre Bayle built up his essay "Contrains-les d'entrer." It is scarcely possible that both Leo XIII. and his advisers should have been so ignorant as this.

---

[6] *Adversus omnes Haereses,* ed. 1534 f. 9 a; ed. 1539 f. 8 b.

Again, the great Canonist Schulte has shown how shamelessly the second chapter of the Vatican Decree *Pastor Eternus* rests upon two doubly falsified quotations. (A.) It quotes a sentence of eight lines as from the Council of Ephesus; yet, first, twelve words are interpolated in order to give a false twist to the whole; and, secondly, the words are no real decision of the Council of Ephesus, as the unwary reader is led to suppose, but simply the partisan claim of a Papal Legate on that occasion. It would not be more false if a modern writer so quoted a counsel's speech as to make us believe he was quoting from a judge's decision. And (B.), six lines are quoted, in a continuous sentence without warning or break, as from St. Irenæus and the Council of Aquileia. But, first, the Irenæus quotation is truncated; the full text shows that he considered Peter as only *primus inter pares.* Secondly, sixteen words of this pretended quotation are simply interpolated; they occur neither in Irenæus nor in the Council Acts. Thirdly, the full text of those Acts, as of Irenæus, support not Peter's autocracy but simply his primacy *inter pares.* As Schulte remarks, we cannot believe the actual forger of these documents, promulgated by Pius IX. in the most solemn Council of modern times, to have been the Holy Ghost.[7]

Another example almost equally striking, though doubtless rather due to ignorance and carelessness than to deliberation, may be found in the new *Index Librorum Prohibitorum,* promulgated a few weeks ago by the present Pope, Pius XI. His election was welcomed as that of a specially learned ecclesiastic, who had long presided over one of the most important libraries in the Roman Church. He is the last man, therefore, from whom the faithful would expect a serious bibliographical error; yet such is the case, unless (more incredible still) he put forth this solemn document without even looking at the proofs of Cardinal Merry del Val's official Preface. In that Preface, while the Cardinal admits that his Church has sometimes discouraged or even forbidden the circulation of Bibles in the vernacular, he adds : "Yet it would not on that account be just to say that the Church has absolutely forbidden Bibles in the vulgar tongue ; it will suffice to recall the fact that, during the seventy years which intervened between the invention of printing and the publication of Luther's German version, more than 200 editions of the Holy Scriptures in different living languages were spread abroad among the peoples, duly approved by the Church." These words, taken in their ordinary sense, convey an almost incredible falsehood. The *Catholic Encyclopædia* itself (apart from one edition which " is said " to have been printed in Denmark, and which the more trustworthy Roman Catholic scholar Vigouroux does not even deign to discuss in his bulky *Dictionnaire de la Bible*) knows of only twenty-one pre-Lutheran editions; fourteen in German, four in Dutch, two in Italian, and one in French. Moreover, *not one of those* was " duly approved by the Church." Miss Deanesly, who went into the subject with great care, concluded: " The printing of German Bibles was done without the approval of the Church."[8] Her book was, of course, reviewed critically, not to say hypercritically, by the Roman Catholic press; but I am not aware that any reviewer attempted to bring evidence which would prove Miss Deanesly wrong and the Cardinal right. It is, in fact, an instance of the extreme ignorance possible, under this Index and censorship system, even among the men from whom we might most expect the quasi-infallibility of a specialist at his own particular job. There would seem no possible explanation but that the Cardinal was grossly deceived by some apologetic manual, and the Pope was not familiar enough with the facts to check him. It may be said truly, perhaps, that more than 200 editions were printed of Psalters and little manuals containing a translation of the Gospels and Epistles for Mass on Holy-days. But, if those could be called " editions of Scripture," the Anglican carries two editions in his hand every time he takes his prayer book to Church (or four, if it is a book of Church Services), and, if ever I pack my pocket Shakespeare into my kit-bag, I there hold thirteen editions (counting by the number of volumes) or nearly forty (counting the plays, the sonnets and the poems separately). The word *Scrittura* is to an Italian what *Scriptures* is to us, an ordinary synonym for the whole Bible; it is not idiomatic in Italian to use the plural form, as we so often do. The whole context suggests—it might almost be said, the argument requires—that there should be no change of sense between the *Biblie* of one sentence, and the *Scrittura* of the next. Therefore, setting aside the only alternative hypothesis, that there is some calculated deception at the bottom of what seems a transparently plain assertion, we have here a very solemn, though unintentional, proclamation of a falsehood which has great historical and theological significance.

---

[7] Schulte, *Die Stellung der Concilien,* etc., Prag. 1871, pp. 294ff ; and Anhang, p. 220ff.

---

[8] *The Lollard Bible* (Camb. Univ. Press, 1920), p. 130. The whole chapter should be read to realise the depth of misstatement into which Cardinal and Pope have incautiously plunged.

If Papal documents can be so little trusted on ordinary easily-ascertainable facts, we need not wonder to find Popes slipping into downright unveracity on the treacherous ground of politics. Mr. Stillman, on p. 393 of his *National Review* article (May, 1899), quotes the story "of the famous and pious Padre Tosti, of Monte Cassino, an intimate and devoted personal friend of the Pope. Under the dictation of His Holiness he wrote a pamphlet entitled *The Conciliation,* which was published with the Pope's approval, the publication of which was the signal for the intensification of the Opposition to all conciliatory measures on the part of the Society of Jesus, supported by the French Embassy, which on its part declared that if the project were not withdrawn the Embassy should be. In the heat of the excitement the Pontiff was taken suddenly and dangerously ill (the popular opinion at once accused the Jesuits of having poisoned him), and when he recovered the 'Conciliation' was withdrawn. The Embassy demanded the formal denunciation of it, and the unlucky pamphlet was disavowed by the Pope; but when Tosti was requested to retract it he refused—what he had written were the words of the Pope, and he, a devout and conscientious Catholic, as he really was, could not retract what the Pope had said. He was assured that his retractation was a mere formality to satisfy the exigencies of the French Government, and that it should not be published but kept under the Pontifical seal as if he had not made it. He finally yielded to the entreaty of the Pope and made the desired retractation, when, to his stupor, the document was at once made public. Tosti, humiliated, his illusions dissipated, withdrew from Rome to his convent and renounced all relations with the Vatican, dying shortly after, his friends say, of grief at his betrayal by the Pope and his horror at the violation of the Pontifical seal, the most sacred of all religious engagements."

Next to the Popes in solemnity, and parallel with them in inaccuracy, come the great Papal congregations. A French Catholic notes: "An instruction of the Propaganda (dated June 2nd, 1835) asserts that 'The Holy See *has always treated it as a principle* that the liberty of Christians on a point so delicate as sacramental confession must in no way be fettered, and it has *always willed* that everyone should be permitted to disclose his sins *to whomsoever he will* among approved ministers.' Now, that assertion is flatly contrary to the truth; for though, nowadays, the force of circumstances has finally imposed [this] liberty, certainly things were otherwise for centuries."[9] The Œcumenical Lateran Council of 1215 compels the parishioner to confess at least once a year to his parish priest; and the permission given later, that he might confess also to some friar of his choice, excited something like a mutiny.

Cardinal Bona advised the suppression of the *Liber Diurnus,* one of the most precious documents of the Roman Chancery, "because Pope Honorius is condemned in the profession of faith of the new Pontiffs."[10] Upon which Father Gratry justly commented, "Behold a fact which overwhelms us; let us prevent its being known!"[11] The same process was not only proposed but carried out for the Breviary. That mediæval service-book, from which every priest is bound daily to recite the service for the day, contained such intolerably awkward admissions not only in the Honorius case but in others, that these were expunged in the

[9] *Ce que,* p. 165.
[10] Sparrow-Simpson, p. 179.
[11] *Ibid.*

sixteenth century, and the suppressions were defended by Cardinal Bellarmine. In one place, where the Pope's authority over *souls* was asserted, the word *animas* was cut out in order to make it possible to argue from the passage that Popes had *political* power over *princes.* Upon this a Catholic supporter of the Doge of Venice commented: "[Cardinal Bellarmine's] fifteenth error is, that he says, those men were inspired by the Holy Ghost who removed the word *animas* from the breviary. I know not whether the Holy Ghost be the author of dissensions; but this I know, that one of His gifts and fruits is peace. . . . It is notorious to all men, that the words which favour lay princes have been cut out, and are still being cut out, from the records of Councils and Canons and other Doctors—nay, from the very Breviaries and Missals—so that men may make trial whether gradually, in process of time, the opinion of the Pope's unlimited power in temporal affairs can be established. The result is that, if any man will compare the books printed in 1530 or 1550 with the modern editions, (whether they treat of Councils or of other matters) he may clearly see what a vintage there has been; so that it is a marvel that we should have found a few grapes, after all this gathering, in defence of our Serene Prince [the Doge or the Emperor]. For this reason, as time goes on, men will cease to believe any writings, and God's Church will be overturned. Let me say this on this occasion offered to me by the Lord Cardinal, and for charity's sake; for I desire above all things that writings be no longer garbled [*depravatae*] in this fashion; let me say this again with all humility and reverence."[12] It is one of the ironies of history that Bellarmine himself became the victim of a similar suppression. His autobiography was published by his fellow-Jesuits in the hope that it might aid their efforts to secure his canonisation. But it was found to produce the opposite effect; desperate efforts were then made to destroy all the copies; and this edition of 1761 has, in fact, perished almost entirely. He has, however, been beatified recently; that is, we are already entitled to implore his intercession in the Court of Heaven; and he will doubtless be canonised in due time.

---

[12] *Defensio Johannis Marsilii,* in *controversiae memorabilis . . . . acta et scripta varia.* Venice, 1606—7, p. 331. (Camb. Univ. Lib. press-mark, Acton, d. 7, 92.)

These men seem to have been more or less willingly mendacious; but there are even more significant cases of forced mendacity; of mendacity under "the Persian lash." Poor Hefele was one of the most conspicuous of these victims. His learning, and the high reputation enjoyed by his *History of the Councils,* made him one of the most formidable opponents of the 1870 Decree. During the Council itself, he wrote another pamphlet on the case of Honorius I., in which he demolished the objections of those who contended that the Pope had not taught heresy at all, or at least had not taught it *ex cathedra.* He was one of those who finally withdrew from the Council in protest; and, after the publication of the Decree, he went on protesting and refusing to publish it in his diocese. His letters, which have been published, show the agonies of a soul on the rack, struggling desperately against the falsehood into which he was being driven. Then, when his resistance had at last been broken down by a pressure scarcely less brutal, though more indirect, than that of the mediæval Inquisition, we find him dancing clumsily on the hot bricks; writing that now at last his soul was at rest, and publishing an amended edition of his *Conciliengeschichte* which should at last be approved by Infallibility. Moreover, in that edition, conformably with some of those whom in earlier days he had most stoutly opposed, he condescended now to actual falsification. By a gross mistranslation of Julius I's letter he made the Pope into *sole* arbiter in a religious matter, whereas the actual text shows that the appeal is to be made, not to the Pope alone, but to *all* the bishops—*πᾶσιν ἡμῖν* —*omnibus nobis* in the Old Latin version.[13]

The authors of *Ce qu'on a fait de l'Eglise* devote the whole of their tenth chapter to *The Spirit of Lying,* taking as their text, from the Liberal Catholic Fogazzaro, "The Spirit of Lying is one of the worst enemies of the Roman Church."

They run briefly through mediæval examples: the False Decretals, and the condemnation to the Index of books which exposed these forgeries; the false relics; the false plea that the Church put no man to death, when it was notorious that the Church would excommunicate, and could then put to death, any magistrate who had been rash enough to spare the life of a heretic condemned by the Church and handed over to his mercy. They quote the warning of Cardinal Capalli to de Rossi, afterwards one of the greatest of Catholic archæologists. "Here in Rome" (he said) "custom keeps up a multitude of stories in which nobody believes. If you present them as true, you will pass, not for a fool, since that is impossible, but for a man with no scientific honesty. If you set them aside, there will be hypocrites to cry 'scandal,' and fools to believe them; therefore you will make many enemies." De Rossi persisted, and had to fight all through his life against this persecuting clique. A modern archbishop warned a young priest away from Bible study: "I, too, tried to say those things; but, alas! I soon realised that the Church, nowadays, is not able to listen to certain truths."[14]

---

[13] See Schulte's review in *Hist. Zeitschrift,* Vol. XXXII., (1874), p. 100. I give Hefele's story much more fully in my volume on Infallibility.

[14] The reader will note that these are conversations for which we have no evidence but that of the reporter; but the book is so full of other verifiable facts, and the authors are so evidently what they profess, Liberal Catholics, that we are entitled to give credence to these incidents which can be paralleled or surpassed by cases for which we have documentary proof.

Canon Ulysse Chevalier, who is in the very first rank of laborious scholars, collected overwhelming evidence against the Loretto story—the miraculous transportation by angels, from Palestine to Italy, of the Virgin Mary's own house. But there would be a riot at Loretto if the Pope gave the story up; therefore, neither the Bishop of Valence nor the Archbishop of Paris dared to give him an *imprimatur;* they referred him to the Master of the Sacred Palace at Rome. The Master acknowledged it as "an intelligent and objective piece of research, by which neither religion nor piety towards the Virgin have anything to lose." Yet not even he dared give an *imprimatur.* Canon Chevalier had only "tacit permission to print"; and, when the book came out, the Pope's Secretary of State, Cardinal Merry del Val, publicly rebuked the Master for the part he had taken in this tacit permission.

This Cardinal, one of the most powerful and most trusted of modern times, and he who, next to Pius XI., is chiefly responsible for the *Index Expurgatorius* of 1929, has himself shown public mendacity all the more striking because of the testimonials which have been constantly given to his unblemished private character. He wrote to the Archbishop of Besançon denying the public rumour that Montagnini had denounced him to Rome. "Now, that denial was a lie; for, at that moment, the Cardinal had in his hands not only a note from Montagnini, but the letter of denunciation itself. Unluckily for him, others also knew that letter; and, a few days afterwards (April 27th), the *Matin* published it, adding 'The diplomatic world . . . can see, by this, how much value we can attach to the word of the Secretary of State of the Holy See.'"[15] Similarly, Merry del Val had repeatedly and publicly denied accusations of interference in French politics. When the Montagnini papers were seized, it was proved to the hilt that these denials had been lies.

This, it may be pleaded, is "politics," and we all

[15] *Ce que,* p. 291.

know what goes on in politics. Well, we may indeed know what will always go on in politics, (as it goes on most of all at the present day in those political circles where Irish and Mediterranean Catholics are most dominant) so long as the Fountain-Head of Religion deliberately employs such methods as these. I find among my papers a typical cutting from *The Westminster Gazette* of Nov. 5th, 1900. "There has been a very pretty quarrel in Sydney. A Roman Catholic Cathedral has just been dedicated, and at the dedication service the Governor (Lord Beauchamp) was present wearing his official garments. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of Wellington. Now in the sermon as written there was a strong anti-Protestant passage. Seeing the Governor present, the Bishop left out the passage—but published it later on in the official report of the proceedings. *Hinc illae lacrimae.* Great indignation meetings have been held, at which the Governor has been severely blamed for being all things to all men to the extent of being officially present at a Roman Catholic function. Certainly in this case the 'villain of the piece' seems to be the Roman Catholic Bishop. He ought either *(a)* to have read the passage in question (in which case the Governor might have walked out) or *(b)* to have published the sermon without it."

It is ingrained in Romanist policy to deny flatly, wherever the man hopes that no definite proof exists; he then calculates that his word will at least counterbalance, or even outweigh, his opponent's. And so it generally is; but sometimes there are awkward miscalculations. When the Bishop of Nice attacked Houtin in the *Bulletin de la Semaine,* the latter amused himself at the expense of the Prelate's bad grammar and spelling. The Bishop retorted that this "miserable" accusation could be sustained only by "attributing to my secretary the blunders of the printer's compositor." Houtin published a facsimile of the letter, *in the Bishop's own handwriting,* which showed clearly the orthographical blunders. He then appealed to his readers: "Decide for yourselves whether the Bishop, when he attributed this letter to his secretary, when he denied that there were blunders in the original, and when he imputed the printed blunders to the compositors on the staff of a Republican journal, was not lying." The Bishop, who up to that point had eagerly maintained his legal right to a constant hearing in the paper, such as is ensured by the French law of libel, relapsed here into silence.[16]

Again, in 1906, Houtin was supplied by the Bishop of Tarentaise, who then employed him as Secretary, to publish notes of the episcopal Assembly and to show how completely, under cover of official secrecy, the Pope was misrepresenting the real views of the episcopate, and goading them on to a conflict with the French Government; there was even an extreme Papalist party which would have welcomed actual civil war. The Archbishop of Besançon publicly branded this information as false. To this Houtin replied: "Anybody who hesitates between our word and that of the Archbishop may come to the office of this paper [*Le Siècle*]. They may compare our documents with the very text of the documents of the Bishop's Assembly. They will see that we have reproduced them very accurately. However, we are not surprised at the Archbishop's denial. In an institution in which everything is based upon falsehood, it is plain that a man cannot rise so high without some aptitude for that practice." At the same time, one of the pillars of orthodoxy, Comte Albert de Mun, was compelled to write to *Le Temps,* "I have not said to the Archbishop of Besançon anything resembling the words which *Le Temps* of yesterday attributes to me [on the Archbishop's authority] concerning the Bishop's Assembly." Upon this Houtin comments: "At that time, the Bishops, their *Semaines Religieuses,* and the other Catholic papers, indulged in a sheer debauch of brazen lies. A few have been recorded in *Ce qu'on a fait de l'Eglise*, pp. 290—5 and 392—6. Mgr. Lacroix [Bp. of Tarentaise] made a collection of them in *dossiers* which he collected carefully from day to day concerning each of his colleagues. I note the following from a letter of Julien de Narfon to Père Hyacinthe (6th April 1908) : 'Cardinal Lecot has just been at his old tricks, and has given the lie to my *Answer from Rome to the Assembly at Bordeaux,* just as he had denied my account of that assembly. This time, I have answered him in *Le Figaro.* The man's unconscientiousness (or cynicism?) is simply prodigious.' "[17]

---

[16] *Prêtre Marié,* 1910, p. 161.

The case of Abbé Mugnier, which Houtin gives, fully documented, on pp. 281—335 of his *Prêtre Marié,* is one of the most significant, but it is far too long for details here.

Pernot, on p. 42 of his *Politique de Pie X.* gives the details of a remarkable passage of arms between Tyrrell and the official organ of the Pope's Secretary of State, the *Corrispondenza Romana.* This paper attacked Tyrrell with a garbled quotation drawn from a certain official correspondence; then, when he met that attack, "new letters were published, still extracted from the secret *dossier,* in proportion as the official journal required them. Father Tyrrell had the last word, and a very clever word also, by asking, on the 28th September, whether the *Corrispondenza,* now that its hand was in, could not complete its 'prudent extracts' by publishing the whole *dossier,* i.e. the whole of the correspondence between himself and the Congregation, from July 4th, 1906, to that day. To this invitation the official organ of the State Secretary [at the Vatican] avoided all reply; and those who know certain letters which Tyrrell wrote or received will not wonder at this silence; for they are convinced that, if this challenge had resulted in an incomplete or inaccurate publication, the English scholar, with his back to the wall, would not have hesitated to put the texts openly right, in their fulness and in their actual words."

---

[17] *Prêtre Marié,* 1910, pp. 374ff.

From Cardinals and Bishops we may come to Sir D. O. Hunter-Blair, Abbot of Fort Augustus and of Dunfermline in succession. He published, in *The Catholic Herald* for March 16th, 1929, an attack upon Mr. Arnold Bennett for having repeated the "parrot cry" that two of the most conspicuous Scottish prelates of the sixteenth century had been libertines in their life; he spoke of "effrontery" and "no trustworthy evidence for the charges": finally, "It would probably be useless to appeal to Mr. Bennett's sense of fairness—if he possesses such a thing." This article was reprinted in triumph by Romanist journals over and over again. Therefore, Dr. Hay Fleming, a well known scholar of St. Andrew's University, specially interested in Beaton and Hamilton as St. Andrew's men, wrote supplying the "trustworthy evidence" which had been demanded for these charges. The whole story is told, with documentary proofs, in a fourpenny pamphlet published by the Scottish Reformation Society, Edinburgh, *Was Cardinal Beaton a Libertine?* The *Catholic Herald* editor refused to print his proofs, though they took up less space than the two and a half columns which had been given to the attack, and certainly contained no equally violent language. Dr. Fleming convicted the Abbot and the editor of extraordinary ignorance of official documents which had long been in print—in one case, since 1770—and, more naturally, of others still in MS. which might be produced. It was only when his letter had been refused, and when the Abbot offered neither evidence nor apology, that he at last wrote with no more than truth (p. 14): "That statement [of the Abbot's] could only proceed from culpable ignorance or shameless audacity; it was really a challenge to anyone who knew better." For Dr. Fleming produces evidence from *The Registers of the Privy Seal and of the Great Seal* proving that, on the face of it, Beaton legitimated at least eleven bastards (p. 7). He allows, however, for the possibility that some of them were twice officially legitimated, to make sure; but, even under that supposition, eight can be proved. Against Archbishop Hamilton the records prove four at least, and possibly six; and his physician, the famous Jerome Cardan, imported from Milan to treat him, has left on record the advice he gave to his archiepiscopal patient in regulation of his commerce with women (p. 10). The *Registers* prove, also, that "about 350 male children and about 50 female children of ecclesiastics were legitimated during the thirty years immediately preceding the Reformation." Also, that the Provincial Council of the Scottish Church in 1549, under Hamilton's own presidency, confessed that "the prevailing discussions and heresies were mainly due to 'the corruption of morals, and profane lewdness of life in churchmen of almost all ranks, together with crass ignorance of literature and all the liberal arts'" (p. 11).

Dr. Fleming goes on (p. 26) to point out the liberties taken by Abbot Hunter-Blair in his translation of Bellesheim's *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Schottland;* very tendencious omissions on the one hand, and, on the other, additions not marked by any warning brackets in the text.

A few further instances may be found in the autobiography of Count Hoensbroech, who left the Jesuits some years ago. "Kelle has discovered that the Order is trying to do away with the accusatory documents of its own secret archives, which are now in the possession of the State. Others, too, have had a similar experience; Mommsen himself informed me that he was cognisant of attempts of the sort; and I myself heard Father Jacob Ratgeb, Provincial of the German Province, say that the documents seized by the Government on the suppression of the Society of Jesus, and stored in various libraries, were still the property of the Society, and their secret removal from the State archives and libraries and restoration to the Jesuit Order could not be regarded as an act of theft. Therefore, it behoves those who are in charge to be on their guard."[18]

Again (Vol. II., p. 86, note): "This quotation by Duhr requires to be explained. As I could not find the remarks of the *advocatus diaboli* at any German library, I begged the Intelligence Bureau for German Libraries in Berlin to ask Duhr in which library the remarks could be found. Duhr replied that they were private property. Thus I am deprived of the possibility of verifying them. And until Duhr produces the work itself, I must place a note of interrogation after his quotation. I have already caught Duhr tripping in regard to many of his quotations, and shall do so again, no doubt."

Again (Vol. II., p. 284, note): "Falsifications of the text are a very common Jesuit means of embellishment. The English Jesuit, Foley, was commissioned by the Order to publish eight large volumes of Records, which furnish a collection of documents concerning the Jesuits in England. The Catholic historian, Taunton, says of this work in the preface to his *History of the Jesuits in England,* p. viii.: 'Foley's value consists almost as much in his omissions as in his admissions. And I am bound to remark that I have found him at a critical point quietly leaving out, without any signs of omission, an essential part of a document which was adverse to his case.' And Taunton supplies the proof for his weighty accusation on p. 313." Taunton, it may here be noted, was a very orthodox priest, historian and admirer of the Benedictines.

Döllinger said to Dr. Plummer (*Expositor,* 1890, Vol. II., p. 119): "There is a little book written by a well known Spanish Jesuit, Mariana,—perhaps the ablest man the Jesuits ever had,—in which he speaks of the diseases already existing in the Society. It was written in Spanish, and afterwards translated into Latin. It has since been published in Spanish again.

[18] Vol. I., p. 189.

The Jesuits declare that it is not Mariana's, and have had it put on the Index. But there is no doubt of its authenticity :—indeed, they sometimes admit it among themselves. I have myself seen a correspondence between a general of the Order and a member of it, in which the genuineness is admitted, but is nevertheless to be denied; and the book is to be kept from members of the Order." Mr. Barrett (pp. 273, 299) gives two other strong instances from the Jesuit Order; one of tampering with a document, and another of encouraging, for worldly profit, a superstition which they know to be "absurd and even heretical."

Moreover, it may almost be said that they have clear dogmatic grounds to justify these falsifications. When Abbé Bourrier shook the dust from his shoes, the *Vérité Française* published an article stating that "he has suddenly left the Church for deeds to which we do not choose to give a name here"—*pour des faits que nous ne voulons pas qualifier ici.* He at once protested; only after a delay of eighteen days did his rectification appear in print, with the comment, "While we await the answer of our contributrix, at present absent from Paris, who gave us an account of M. Bourrier's Protestant sermon, we will make one single remark: How can any man, who has been a Catholic priest, assert that in leaving the Roman Church he has remained in full possession of his honour, his reason, and his liberty?" To this M. Bourrier adds: "This contribution is still *en voyage;* he has never yet replied."[19] Yet the editor's comment is perfectly orthodox Romanism; far more orthodox than what we citizens of non-Romanist countries hear from those Romanists who try to persuade us that they respect independence of thought. The Jesuit Father Perrone, who had such immense influence under Pius IX., and for whom Newman had so deep a respect, wrote in his *Catechism,* officially approved in 1854, "Can those who pass from the Catholic Church to Protestantism have this [excuse of] invincible ignorance? *R.* The mere thought is absurd. . . . It is a contradiction and an impossibility that any Catholic should turn Protestant through honest motives; we might as well talk of committing a grievous and heinous sin from honest motives. *D.* Would you therefore say that no Catholic who turns Protestant can ever be saved? *R.* I say that it is certain, with the certainty of faith, that all Catholics who turn to Protestantism are damned; except those cases where a man repents sincerely before his death and abjures the errors he has professed. Except for such a case as this, it is an article of faith that all Catholics who become Protestants are damned irremediably for all eternity. *D.* Why do you say that this damnation is one of the *certainties of faith?* *R.* Because it is a plain revelation of God." (Chap. xv.)

---

[19] *Ceux qui,* p. 9.

And this same spirit leads to the natural encouragement of such wild inventions as the *Santa Casa* of Loretto, so long as they seem to be " edifying." Father Leonetti, professor at the *Collegio Nazareno* in Rome, has invented the fiction that Pope Alexander VI's sons were in fact his nephews; and this fiction was supported in 1880 by three prominent Roman Catholic papers, *Univers, Rev. du Monde Catholique,* and *Nouv. Ann. de Phil. Chrétienne.*[20]

The more educated among the faithful are perfectly aware of this priestly temptation, and make allowance for it. It is one of the many survivals from mediæval conditions. Bishop Thomas of Cantimpré, who had been a fellow-pupil of Aquinas under Albertus Magnus, has recorded " that which I heard from a very straightforward [*simplicissimo*] layman in the diocese of Cambrai. Certain monks had broken a promise to which they had pledged their word to him. The man, seeing no other way of excusing them, said: 'These monks daily lie and break their promise to me; but I believe they lie by leave of their abbot.' This, to the present day, is a proverbial saying in those parts; when any monk lapses from the truth, men say 'no blame to him; he lies by leave of his abbot.' "[21] Thus, when Father Tyrrell pointed out in *The Times* that the new Encyclical *Pascendi* evidently condemned Newman's doctrine of Development, and a prominent member of the hierarchy wrote hastily to assure the public that it did no such thing, then many of the Catholic laity were far less impressed by this *démenti* than candid Protestant readers were. A friend reported to me, that very evening, what he had just heard at the *Athenæum.* One of the oldest Catholics in the club, a friend of Acton's, laid down *The Times* with the very audible remark: "The man is lying, and he knows he is." When, again, Houtin's documentary evidence, and the Comtesse de Fallois's own recollections, convicted of deliberate falsehood one of the best-known parish priests in Paris, the Countess thus ended her letter to the offender: "As for you, dear Monsieur l'Abbé, whom I credit with being neither a clericalist nor a bad man, but simply one whose circumstances have placed you in a situation where frankness is difficult and dangerous, I repeat to you here the expression of my old feelings of affection." As she had written the day before to another friend, "his speciality is his marvellous facility of adaptation to the very different *milieux* which he haunts. One day, in the morning, I had found him thrilled with enthusiasm, as I was, by Zola's famous letter [in defence of Dreyfus], *J'accuse.* That evening, at Notre-Dame-de-Sion, in a speech before an audience of Ambassadors' wives and Duchesses, I heard him say 'My shoulders are weighed down this evening by the burden of that odious act which has just been committed by a man whose name I cannot pronounce before you.' . . . We must never ask for sincerity in priests. When they have it, then, sooner or later, they break with a Church which has no use for them."[22]

---

[20] Houtin, *Quest. Bib. XX.s.,* p. 252.

---

[21] *Bonum Universale,* etc., lib. II., c. 26. (Ed. Douai, 1597, p. 214.)

Another layman has expressed himself very frankly on this subject: "The Catholic Truth Society's publications are the class of literature on which the submerged seven-tenths are fed by the priests. If I were asked to give a name to that Society I should call it The Catholic Untruth Society; and I consider the lay members of the upper three-tenths of our Church who belong to it a discredit to human nature. The following list of its publications for June, 1902, discloses the class of nutriment on which the minds of the young priests are now nourished at Maynooth, and by which the lay mind of the remnant of the nation would, to a large extent, be corroded in the priests' university."[23]

Here, again, are a French layman's words to the clergy: "You dare not admit frankly that one passage in the Bible is interpolated, and you let it figure in one of the Epistles at Mass, in order to avoid scandal; yet it never occurs to you that thus you are discrediting Catholicism, and giving a handle to ill-intentioned folk to say 'Catholics have watertight minds, they have learned nothing and want to learn nothing; clearly they rebel against all progress and all intellectual honesty.'"[24]

Finally, here is the protest of a well known Catholic journalist in France, who tried to keep his integrity. "When [a Catholic journalist] is sincere, disinterested and courageous, he runs, I must confess, many risks. To begin with, he risks being given the lie, that bugbear of all journalists who take their professional duties seriously. Flat contradiction is a very frequent weapon in the religious world; indeed, it has been so overdone that its meaning has changed altogether, it seldom imposes now upon anybody. It no longer means, necessarily, nowadays, that an assertion is false, but merely that it is inconvenient and inopportune for certain combinations, great or small, which, after all, the asserter was not evidently bound to consider above everything else. Let me be permitted here (though egotism is hateful, and it is not very proper to come forward personally) to recount in this connection a misadventure of which I myself was the victim about ten years ago. I had just published in the *Figaro* (of course with the permission of my occasional correspondent) a letter which a curé in the diocese of Aix had sent me, containing certain criticisms on the administration of his archbishop, who was then Mgr. Gouthe-Soulard, of impetuous memory. When I had published this, with appropriate commentaries, the curé in question thanked me as follows: 'Sir, I have just read in the *Figaro,* with the keenest pleasure, what I might call your splendid study of the case of Mgr. Gouthe-Soulard. You have caught the true note. Not a priest in the diocese of Aix will contradict you. Thanks for the signal service which you have rendered to the cause of justice and truth,' and so on. This letter of thanks was dated Feb. 20th, 1900. Now, from that same cleric, on the 3rd of March following, I received a fresh letter which ran as follows:—'Sir, the impression produced by your article of Feb. 18th was such that the Archbishop has started on the warpath and has let loose all his bloodhounds in search of the curé who wrote the letter. You have already been obliged to insert [in the *Figaro*] the protest of the Vicars General. You will have to insert also the protest which they have drawn up and which will probably be signed by all the curés of the diocese. We are under a régime of terror. Among the names of the signatories, I have seen all those of my colleagues who have been treated worst; but they would have drawn far heavier thunderbolts upon their heads if they had refused their testimonial. Under this fear, and for motives like theirs, I have had to sign also, moulding my conscience and attaching, in such circumstances, only a very slight value to my signature. You will perhaps think me wrong, Sir: but what ought I to have done, if not to keep my priestly honour thus whole and safe in the eyes of my colleagues, and to escape a regular persecution from the Archbishop, who certainly would have ruined my future? If, as I believe, all the curés of the diocese, victims of this pressure which has been applied to them all this time, give their adhesion to this document hatched by the Archbishop himself, you are sure to find some clever way of getting out of this job. But I beseech you, Sir, render me the service of leaving me quite alone this time. I will return you that service later on, when this squall has gone by.' The unanimous protest of the curés of Aix reached the *Figaro* a few days later, and was inserted without comment. Of course, I found therein the signature of my correspondent, whose writing I easily recognised; and a journal which was not only Catholic but religious, and which certainly had a very fine title, *La Vérité,* took this opportunity of stigmatising me as a forger. Nevertheless, I kept the secret demanded of me; and this proves that we journalists need sometimes something harder than the courage of our opinions; we need the courage of silence. I had almost forgotten to add that the excellent curé, who had promised to indemnify me, never gave the least sign of life from that day forward. However that may be, you will not be surprised that this experience has made me somewhat sceptical as to the value of ecclesiastical denials."[25]

---

[22] Houtin, *Prêtre Marié,* pp. 323, 327.

[23] Michael McCarthy, *Priests and People in Ireland,* 1902, p. 578.

[24] Prof. Robert Beudant of Grenoble, in Rifaux, *Conditions,* p. 122.

And the same author again, on p. 223 of the same review: "Our bishops praise the acts of the Holy See in public, after having blamed them behind the Pope's back. One day a bishop had said to me at an expansive moment that, if the Pope forbade the

---

[25] *Athèna,* Jan., 1911, p. 158.

mutualités ecclésiastiques,[26] then it would be 'nothing short of madness' [*une véritable folie*]. Before that week was out, Rome forbade the *mutualités ecclésiastiques.* I believe that this particular bishop was the first who promulgated this Roman decision [throughout his diocese]; and, in his letter of promulgation, he thought it his duty to explain that Pius X. could not have acted otherwise; that this decision was absolutely necessary, and that the Holy Father, by deciding thus, had once more saved the Church of France! Not long afterwards, circumstances brought me again to this prelate's presence; and I could not refrain from expressing my astonishment. His answer was that, when Rome has spoken, the bishop's only duty is to prove (whatever may have been his own opinion hitherto) that Rome has been right, because it is important for the maintenance of unity that the bishops should behave thus." And for the third time, on p. 231 of his *Séparation de l'Eglise et de l'Etat,* de Narfon tells the story of a deliberate semi-official forgery to mislead the public as to the real opinions of the French episcopate in this conflict between Pius X. and the Government of the Republic.

---

[26] The *mutualités ecclésiastiques* were a state system of insurance for priests, brought in while the Concordat was still in force. Pius X., in his struggle with the French Republic, repudiated this together with other points which, to his mind, implied undue submission of Church to State. The story was told at the time by Maurice Pernot, in chapter vii. of *La Politique de Pie X.*

CHAPTER XVII.

GARBLING AND FORGERY.

AFTER a good deal of reading, I have no hesitation in saying that it is impossible to trust a Romanist book as one naturally trusts other books by educated men. I do not, of course, mean for one moment that there are not trustworthy Romanist writers; but experience convinces me that such accuracy and impartiality as is normal in modern literature of the first class is rather exceptional in Romanism.

Of Ryder's book against Littledale I have already spoken; let me deal now with a similar work, Dom Chapman's reply to Bishop Gore. There again, the reply is a distinctly abler piece of controversy than the book to which it replies; every rhetorical artifice is there, and sometimes rhetorical power in its least invidious form. But there is also the artifice which can scarcely fail to realise that it is (to put it in the mildest form) "economising truth," and that the enormous majority of readers will infer from the writer's turn of phrase, or from his silence, something very different from what the writer would be compelled to answer if he were being cross-examined under oath in the law-courts.

One of the greatest stumbling blocks for Infallibilists, as we have seen, is Keenan's Catechism. Able Romanists see only too clearly that the current attempts to explain it away will not hold water. We are told that it does not combat Infallibility, but only condemns it as inopportune; yet this excuse is in plain contradiction with Keenan's second answer: "no decision of his [the Pope's] can oblige under pain of heresy, unless it be received and enforced by the teaching body, that is, by the bishops of the Church." Others, again, puff it aside as a mere private opinion; yet many thousands of the book were sold, under the highest episcopal sanction, between 1846 and 1870; moreover, it is known that a very large party, and in all probability the large majority of Roman Catholics in Great Britain, agreed with Keenan. Ryder knew this, and therefore he silently omitted all allusion to Littledale's argument from Keenan. Dom Chapman knew it also, and therefore he is equally silent in the face of Bishop Gore's argument from it (p. 123). On the same page, Bp. Gore quotes from Bp. Baines, "he did not believe any Catholics in England or Ireland maintained the Infallibility of the Pope"; here, again, Dom Chapman preserves an incomprehensible silence. Again, St. Jerome accused Pope Liberius of having "subscribed to heretical depravity." Dom Chapman (p. 72, b.) while apparently meeting other details of this argument in full, takes no notice of Jerome's damning words. Gore exposes the interpolation of a pro-Roman clause into the acts of the Council of Nicæa, a clause defended by no respectable scholar of to-day; he points out how even "one of the most learned of English Roman Catholic historical writers," Allies, relied upon this forgery as upon a fact, and attributed equal weight to the equally unhistorical assertion that Hosius was a Roman legate. I cannot find in Dom Chapman, (who at this point deserts the direct order of reply) either any attempt to prove the authenticity of those two points, so often stressed by controversialists of his Church even to-day, or any confession that Dr. Gore was right in repudiating them as he and the majority of other scholars do. With regard to St. Cyprian, again (p. 119) Bp. Gore points out that "no language can be more forcible than that in which both Cyprian and Firmilian assert their own episcopal independence against what they regarded as the arrogant claim of St. Stephen" to dictate to them about heretical baptism. Here, again, I have vainly sought for any reply. The decree of the Council of

Constance, repudiating Infallibility, is naturally emphasised by Bp. Gore; but it is ignored by his critic.[1] Finally, Bishop Gore had spoken of what so many other historical students feel, "the certainty that Ultramontane writers will always be found manipulating facts and making out a case." This is a very mild paraphrase of what Newman and Acton had privately confessed in much plainer language, but here, very naturally, Dom Chapman feels that some answer is necessary. He writes (p. 97, a.): "Nothing would be easier than for me to bring the same accusation against Dr. Gore, were it not that I know his personal character. Does he know of any 'Ultramontane writer' so unscrupulous, unfair, untruthful, as 'Janus'? Has he met with any 'Roman controversialist' as disreputable as Dr. Littledale? I often disagree with arguments put forward on the Catholic side, nay, they often annoy me greatly. There is no subject on which argument does not lead people to exaggerate. But Protestant history from the Magdeburg centuriators and Foxe to Froude, has been a series of lies, whether intentional, careless, or prejudiced. There is nothing like this on the Catholic side, since the Middle Ages. I do not make Dr. Gore answerable for Protestant historians, nor will I myself be answerable for mediæval forgers, who, however, seldom worked in favour of the Papacy."

The last sentence here is quite mistaken; but we may let that pass. The whole passage interested me so much when it first came out, that I wrote to Dom Chapman asking for brief indications which would enable me to verify his assertions. I pointed out, for instance, that Froude and Foxe had found the severest criticism from non-Romanist authors: could anything be alleged against them like (for instance) Cardinal

---

[1] I need hardly say that, if I am mistaken here in asserting that most difficult of things, a negative, I will gladly insert a slip here to indicate the page on which, in fact, Dom Chapman has met the points which he seems to me to have evaded.

Gasquet's cold-blooded reprints of exposed untruths? or who, on the Romanist side, had dared even to whisper these things, let alone expose them in the unsparing fashion in which Freeman set upon Froude? Dom Chapman, in reply, declined to help me to any verification of his accusations. Last year, again, having to study the Vatican Council in more detail, I wrote asking him to justify his specific accusation against "Janus" by jotting down upon an enclosed post card the name of any book in which that author had been convicted of "untruthfulness." His answer ran: "Many thanks for your letter. I am sorry you do not share the opinion I formed many years ago as to the value of 'Janus.'" This, in my experience, is quite characteristic even of the highest authorities in Dom Chapman's Church; in fact, it is upon this policy that they live. They backbite antagonistic authors; and it becomes a byword in their religious press that So and So is negligible, because he has been attacked by Father So and So. But, when called upon to substantiate their defamation, they are silent; from the mere parish priest upwards, they adopt the diocesan's attitude towards Houtin: "a Bishop does not argue, he condemns."

I turned, therefore, to the book which I knew had the greatest reputation, Cardinal Hergenröther's *Anti-Janus*. It testifies to the learning of the author and his circle; it unquestionably corrects altogether some of "Janus's" statements and convicts others of exaggeration, which is not wonderful considering that Döllinger had to compose the book in a few weeks during the preparations for the Council, under the utmost pressure lest things should go too far before the public could receive warning. But it is far from justifying Dom Chapman's off-hand condemnation; for, when all errors and exaggerations are stripped away, it still leaves the bulk of Janus' fabric standing. And this Cardinal, in 1870, like his admirer in 1905, is singularly blind to the points which need most explanation.

Hergenröther avoids going into the actual facts of Cyprian's and Firmilian's refusal to accept papal ruling on the question of heretical baptism[2] (pp. 111, 149, where he falls back upon the assertion that others have dispensed him from arguing the point)! He is altogether silent on the subject of the forged testimonies, professing to be from the Greek Fathers, upon which St. Thomas Aquinas and Urban IV. built their theory of papal supremacy, although Janus devotes six pages to the subject (262ff). He similarly ignores the damning fact that the Theological Faculty of the University of Paris, in 1388, "enumerated a whole series of errors in St. Thomas, and classed among them this very doctrine of Papal Infallibility: they distinctly call it heresy."[3] This was the period during which Paris was incontestably the greatest theological school of the Church; in 1333 the Faculty had called upon John XXII. to recant his pet doctrine of the Beatific Vision.[4] Again, on pp. 278—286, "Janus" rehearses the pro-Papal forgeries perpetrated by Petrus Comestor, Tolomeo of Lucca, Pelayo of Oviedo and

---

[2] Apologists who are compelled to face this assert, as Fr. Pope did in a public disputation at Cambridge, that this was no matter of faith or morals, but only of Church discipline! As though we could remove from the domain of faith a question of which the gist is: "Can we believe that thousands of persons, baptised in a certain way, have any chance of heaven, or must we believe them to be bound for hell?"

[3] D'Argentré, *Collect. Judiciorum,* Vol. I. ii. p. 84. A friar, claiming St. Thomas' authority, had written "that the examination and decision of things concerning the faith belong to the Chief Pontiff alone." This, decides the Paris Doctors "contains a manifest heresy—nay, many heresies," of which the first is that it conflicts with Canon Law, which decides that "in matters of faith we may appeal from the Pope to a General Council."

[4] Rashdall, *Universities,* Vol. I., p. 531. "The reply of John XXII. is as humble and apologetic as if he were a young student at Paris in danger of losing his Bachelor's degree for heresy. He apologises for venturing to express an opinion upon a theological question when he was not a Doctor of Divinity."

Lucas of Tuy; all these are silently ignored in *Anti-Janus;* and these are the evasions which enable apologists to repeat, as Dom Chapman does, that mediæval forgers "seldom worked in favour of the Papacy." That they had not always this end deliberately in view, is true; but it would be difficult to name any mediæval forgery of more than purely local importance (e.g. monastic charters forged in favour of a particular abbey) which has not, in fact, worked in favour of the Papacy. Moreover, Hergenröther in one place goes beyond the mere *suppressio veri:* he adopts and utilises for his own argument that garbled quotation from St. Augustine which was among the forgeries which had most effect at the Vatican Council: "*Roma locuta est,* causa finita est" (p. 67).

The subject of books garbled for "edification" during the years preceding the Vatican Council occupies a dozen pages in Friedrich's *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils* (I. 543ff). The standard books for seminaries were professedly maintained under the same names, but so radically changed that the defunct authors were made to say, with regard to Infallibility, the opposite of what they had actually written! This movement was specially strong in the late 'sixties; so that 1870 found the ground carefully prepared. When the text book, even thus garbled, was too far behind the movement to be serviceable, it was put upon the Index. Thus Bailly's *Théologie,* on which generations of priests had been trained between 1789 and 1842, was falsified in that latter year and put upon the Index in 1853: then, at one French Seminary, it was publicly and solemnly burned, with a reference to Acts xix. 19. Guyot published a so-called *Somme des Conciles,* in which he suppressed the clause of the Sixth Œcumenical Council condemning Pope Honorius, and in the decree of Constance, changed the Council's claim of superiority over the Pope "quoad *fidem*" into "quoad *finem.*"

Alzog was one of the best historians among German

Catholics of the last two generations. He was one of the Consultors for arranging the proceedings of the Vatican Council. His *Church History,* which in the English translation fills four volumes, is about as impartial as it is possible for any writer to be who is professionally pledged to one side on matters of serious dispute. It was early translated into French, and became a text-book in the best seminaries in those two countries. The ninth edition, at last, was translated by two American seminary-professors, Pabisch and Byrne, on the plea that "*the utter inadequacy of all the existing manuals of Church History, in English, is too notorious to require further mention here.*"[5] They protest their honesty (pp. vii., ix.): "Owing to the terminology of Church History, or to the vagueness of the author's style, his meaning is often obscure—at least to those just entering upon the study—and the translators, in order to remove this obscurity, have frequently departed from the exact phraseology of the German original, and have, in all cases, deemed it of more consequence to bring out the sense of the author in idiomatic English, than to scrupulously adhere to the German text. There are many reasons for this course; the principal of which is, that it is of vastly more importance to interpret an author's ideas, than to give an exact translation of his language. It is not, however, to be inferred that any passages of the original have been either altered or omitted; on the contrary, everything has been conscientiously given, but very often with additions and amplifications. . . . . This *translation,* while scrupulously faithful, is, as has been said, not a slavish rendering of the German, but embodies the results acquired from the reading of various reliable authors, and may, it is hoped, be a partial improvement on the original."

I have only looked at a few crucial passages, where it seemed that this question of honesty would probably be most clearly tested, and here are the results. The references shall be given to sections, which are numbered the same in Alzog's original (ninth edition) and in the translation which claims to follow that edition.

---

[5] Preface p. v. (italics as in original). All my quotations are from the Dublin reprint of 1879, "carefully revised and corrected."

(1.) Of the Council of Nicæa, Alzog writes (§ 111) that it dealt with "the hierarchical rank of the Patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch." The translators here smuggle in an interpolation: "*the primacy of the Roman Church,* and the hierarchical, etc." Alzog knew perfectly well that nothing but ignorance or dishonesty can stand, without form of argument, upon words which first appear in a Roman translation of the Greek canons of Nicæa after nearly five generations of men had passed away! He was one of the really learned Germans who based their Catholicity on very different pretensions from this. The translators, on the other hand, could not afford to let their seminarists suspect that this important forgery is now abandoned.[6]

(2.) Alzog (§ 116) quotes St. Augustine's famous words to Innocent I. correctly. The translators quote it in the falsified form which has been traditional for generations in their Church, and which played its full part in 1870: "*Rome has spoken,* the affair is ended."

(3.) With regard to the heretics of Languedoc and Innocent III's crusade against them, Alzog is again too impartial for his translators. They make eleven separate interpolations, amounting altogether to twenty-three lines (§ § 235, 236). Their main purport is to emphasise against the heretics those accusations of personal immorality, and of doctrines subversive even of civil society, which are the staple of modern apologists, but which are inconsistent with much of our most trustworthy contemporary evidence from orthodox sources. With regard to the Waldensians, the translators permit themselves not only additions, but omissions. Alzog, for instance, notes with obvious sympathy that these men "strove, before everything else, for moral and religious reform within the Catholic Church, beginning with *the clergy*." This too favourable sentence is altogether omitted, as is also the fact that the Waldensian propaganda was directed "at first, only against the *external Church* system and worldly possessions." In both these sentences, the italics are Alzog's own.

---

[6] I mean, of course, by scholars. The Dominican Fr. Pope, however, quoted the interpolated words during the recent debate at Cambridge, and was embarrassed, though impenitent, when they could not be found in the original. See my *The Pope not Infallible,* pp. 48, 62.

Here, again, is an instance which cannot be excused as legitimate paraphrase.

Alzog.	Pabisch and Byrne.
"The dissemination [of these heresies] gained a certain impetus from the frequently small satisfaction of religious wants through the clergy. The pride which is natural to every sect was thus intensified even to the repudiation of all that was mysterious, and to stormy zeal against the existing ecclesiastical system. The path had been prepared for these enthusiasts by Arnold of Brescia in Northern Italy, and in France by the free tone of the troubadours, mocking at the hierarchy."	". . . it is certain that THE IMMEDIATE AND DIRECT SOURCE of these heresies is to be sought in the peculiar character of certain individuals, and in their exceptional relations to the Church. Heretics have at all times sought to justify THEIR PRETENDED ZEAL BY ALLEGING THAT THE CLERGY FAILED TO SATISFY THE RELIGIOUS WANTS OF THE PEOPLE, and, it must be admitted, the charge had at times a very substantial foundation. BUT BEYOND THIS THEY HAD NO ADEQUATE GROUND OF COMPLAINT, AND NO JUSTIFICATION OF THEIR CONDUCT. IGNORANT AND SUPERCILIOUSLY

PROUD, they affected a contempt of the mysteries of faith, and manifested a fierce hostility to whatever was connected with the Church. Arnold of Brescia, in Upper Italy, and the Troubadours in Southern France, a class of men ever ready to sneer at bishops and priests, prepared the way for these fanatical sectaries."

(4.) Sections 270 and 271 deal with the Councils of Constance and Bâle. Here, again, our translators take great liberties, though not always with any definitely tendencious purpose. They are certainly not honest, however, in dealing with Alzog's commentary on the decree of Constance concerning the Infallibility question.

ALZOG.	PABISCH AND BYRNE.
"In themselves [*an sich*] these principles [or *axioms, Grundsätze*] were unsound and condemnable; they did not apply to a healthy body, in which *all parts* must work in unison for a common end. According to that [principle], the head exists *with* the whole body and *in it;* without [the head] all the rest is dead. Since the Head of the Church, particularly, unites the ful-	"The propositions are, *from the very nature of the case,* both inadmissible and incapable of defence; for in a body full of life and vigour, *each member* contributes to the general welfare, and if the Church is such, the principles contained in these articles are not applicable to her, NOR COULD HER TRUE CHILDREN HAVE FRAMED THEM. In matter of fact, the head is neither above nor sub-

ness of ecclesiastical power in himself, and, according to the requisites of an Œcumenical Council which are NOWADAYS clearly defined, the Pope summons it and presides over it, therefore, IN A CERTAIN SENSE, the Pope stands *above* the Council. Therefore that superiority of the Council which is here proclaimed [in the decree of Constance] does not apply to the normal condition of the Church; yet it appeared NECESSARY through the conditions which had grown up in such an abnormal fashion, and because it was disputable *who was the true Pope*. Three Popes were now shattering the Church's unity and freedom, and none would bring himself to yield or resign; none would recognise any judge.

"It seemed that such an evil, in the absence of effective laws, could not be remedied but by the acceptance and establishment of the proposition that the Pope stands below a General Council; ordinate to the body. It is *of* the body, and constitutes, *with* it, but one organisation. No body can exist without its head, and no head without its body. They are inseparable. The conditions to the existence of a body in the natural order are verified in the case of the Church also, she being a mystical body, of which Christ is the invisible and the Pope the visible Head. THE ASSERTION, THEREFORE, CONTAINED IN THE PROPOSITIONS THAT AN ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL IS COMPLETELY INDEPENDENT OF THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH, IS DESTRUCTIVE OF THE VERY FUNDAMENTAL IDEA OF THE LATTER. ALL CATHOLICS BELIEVE, WITH UNQUESTIONING FAITH, THAT THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH POSSESSES THE FULNESS OF ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY, AND THAT IN ORDER TO HAVE AN ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL, IN THE ORTHODOX SENSE OF THESE WORDS, IT IS NECESSARY THAT THE POPE SHALL CONVOKE SUCH COUNCIL, AND ESSENTIAL THAT HE SHALL PRESIDE, EITHER PERSON-that an Œcumenical Council can judge him not only in matters concerning the faith, but also in all that concerns the abolition of the schism and the reformation of morals; and that it may even depose him according to the circumstances [*nach Befinden der Sachlage*]. For even Gerson had been obliged to confess that 'it was only the agony and confusion of the schism which had compelled the Council to repudiate the hitherto universally current teaching of the superiority of Papal authority' (*De potest. eccles.*, consid. X. et XII.). Herein lay the mistake of the Fathers of Constance, that they set up, as a *dogmatic principle* valid for all time, a thing which WAS TO SOME EXTENT JUSTIFIED by the necessities of a grievous time."

ALLY OR BY HIS LEGATES, AND GIVE HIS APPROBATION TO ITS DECREES. Hence the Pope is in some sort *above* an Œcumenical Council.

"But, on the other hand, the circumstances which led to the convening of the Council of Constance were so unprecedented and abnormal that they seemed, for the time being, TO GIVE COLOUR TO the assumption of independence. The three Popes (it being *uncertain which was the true one*) had really cut themselves off from communion with the Church, had rent asunder her unity, and refused to listen to moderate and just demands. Each of them was equally unwilling to yield any of his claims, to abdicate, or even to submit the question to arbitration. It seems that the only way out of a difficulty so vast and threatening was to declare and maintain that the Pope was subject to an Œcumenical Council, and that when guilty of any offence against faith, or of any attempt to prevent the closing of schism, or the general reformation of morals, he might be lawfully deposed by it.

"AT A STILL LATER DATE, MANY OF THE FATHERS OF CONSTANCE ASSERTED THAT THE POPE WAS ABOVE AN ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL, AND DEFENDED THE DOCTRINE WITH ABILITY. AND IF GERSON AFTERWARDS ASSAILED THE SAME DOCTRINE IN HIS PUBLIC WRITINGS, HE ALSO CONCEDED THAT THE QUESTION DID NOT AS YET ADMIT OF A DEFINITIVE SOLUTION, and confessed 'that nothing but the confused state of opinion consequent upon a season of protracted schism could have brought the council to set aside the doctrine of papal supremacy, which had heretofore been universally accepted.'

"The great mistake of the theologians of Constance consisted in giving to a line of action, to which they were driven by an abnormal condition of affairs, the force and authority of a *dogmatic principle*."

I have here marked the main infidelities by small capitals. As for the translation of *an sich,* which is of real importance for Alzog's meaning, there is no doubt that the translators are right in pleading the occasional difficulty of the German. But, after consulting one German professor and two who have studied in Germany, I get the unanimous verdict that my translation is, even in its immediate context, the more probable. The latter part of the paragraph, which is too long to quote here, is almost incompatible with Pabisch and Byrne's rendering. Their garbling of Alzog's Gerson allusion can be realised only from fuller documentary evidence, which I print in the Appendix. Alzog has said, very cautiously, the most that a learned and honest man can say about Gerson's state of mind on the matter of Infallibility. Gerson had no intention of repudiating the plain words of the Constance decree (of which he was one of the main authors) but he realises how invidious a thing it is for a Council to sit in judgment upon a Pope and to take matters of faith, if only for a moment, out of the hands of the ordinary executive; therefore he stresses the cruel necessity which had forced the Council to assert this unwelcome truth. The truth itself he never recanted; this may be seen from my Appendix, where his whole teaching is summed up by a scholar as Ultramontane as Pabisch and Byrne, but far more learned.

(5.) In a few other places I have found smaller infidelities. In § 277, *Morals of the Clergy,* there are quite unnecessary paraphrases and additions which tend to blunt Alzog's plain confessions. Again, where Alzog writes that Melanchthon "with extensive knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, explored the literal sense of the Old Testament," they translate, "was enabled *to give a tolerably satisfactory explanation* of the literal sense," etc. (§ 338) Again in the Galileo question, they feel bound to exaggerate the words of the original. (§ 350.) So again in a note on the Council of Trent (§ 343, p. 424), since here, again, the Vatican Council and Infallibility are at stake.

(6.) When at last we come explicitly to that crucial subject, their solemn promise of the Preface becomes a mere scrap of paper (§ § 413 a, 413 b). To begin with, Alzog's 10,000 words are raised to 13,000 by additions from the translators' own pens, not only without any sort of warning, but with explicit falsehood, since one of these spurious interpolations speaks definitely in the singular :—

Alzog.	Pabisch and Byrne.
"Since we cannot relate these momentous events without deep emotion and sympathy [*innere Bewegung und Theilnahme*] therefore it pains us to be obliged to record the following facts [the creation of the 'Old Catholic' Church] as results of the repudiation of such warnings [as Hefele of Rottenburg uttered after he himself had submitted to the Pope]."	" It is with sorrow and reluctance, WHICH NO OTHER MOTIVE THAN THE GRAVITY OF OUR DUTY AS AN HISTORIAN COULD OVERCOME, that we now go on to relate some of the sad consequences that resulted from turning a deaf ear to warnings and admonitions like that of the Bishop of Rottenburg."

Alzog was, personally, in very considerable sympathy with these seceders, one of whom, in another place, the translators, quite falsely, make him stigmatise as *apostate*.[7] Alzog himself had been the one man among the eighteen of the Pope's Dogmatic Commission preparatory to the Council, who had dared to vote against the introduction of the Infallibility Decree.[8] The

[7] There is a similar falsification on p. 251. Alzog makes accusations against the morals of one French priest who refused to accept the Vatican Decree; the translators (1) exaggerate the language greatly, and (2) apply it to the other two also: "The characters of all of them are such that it is a charity to pass them over in silence."

[8] Th. Frommann, *Gesch. d. Vat. Concils,* p. 22.

translators, while garbling his words, represent them as coming from this man who would never have written them. This misrepresentation is emphasised by the fact that (e.g.) on pp. 234—5 the translators, adding a few brief bibliographical notes, mark these scrupulously " (Tr.)."

This, however, is a small matter compared with their other liberties. To bring out the full enormity of these, it would be necessary to quote nearly the whole of these lengthy sections side by side in Alzog and in the translation; a few examples must suffice, which I will number this time by pages.

The very first sentence is falsified. Alzog quotes the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* for "the inward connection of these two events [the *Syllabus* and the proclamation of a General Council] as a matter that goes without saying" [*selbstverständlich*]. That journal was the most learned of those published by the Jesuits, who themselves were in far closer touch with the Pope than any other Order; and Alzog clearly implies that he himself believes the connection there asserted. The translators, however, represent him as writing "between this publication [of the *Syllabus*] and the Vatican Council, men of judgment and ability have professed to find a close and even necessary connection. The Pope imposed silence on the Cardinals as to what he had said," and they go on for a page and a quarter of assertions which, mainly true in themselves, are yet tendenciously phrased and have no counterpart whatever in Alzog himself. And, while inserting this anti-Alzog stuff (as we may fairly call it) they omit his confession that, while many welcomed the Vatican Council, the idea of it " awakened in others misgiving, nay, alarms of many kinds." Then, when the most important and debatable points come, the divergence becomes wider and wider. Page 238 begins to omit wholesale; it becomes a real puzzle to find fragments of this too honest Alzog floating about in the ocean of Pabisch and Byrne. Dupanloup, the greatest of the

French Bishops, promised France that there should be no "exaggerations of dogma" at the Council; this our translators omit. Presently, again, comes the friction caused by the Order of Proceedings prescribed by the Pope's absolute authority, which seemed to load the dice without shame. (1.) "The happy trust of numerous Bishops," writes Alzog, "was, however, disturbed and troubled by the publication of the bull *Multiplices inter,* concerning the Order of Proceedings." Pabisch and Byrne describe this bull with complete sympathy. Alzog goes on to point out that this was a clear breach with the traditions of the Council of Trent; he adds: (2.) "Nay, the displeasure and anxiety of many Fathers of the Council was further increased" by the publication of the Papal constitution *Apostolicae Sedis;* he describes how the protest was summarily ruled out in debate by the President; and finally, (3.) "still more serious complaints were heard concerning the management of the revised Order of Business; complaints which resulted in a written protest signed by more than 100 prelates of all nations. Again, the agitation among the Fathers of the Council was especially increased by the fact that, early in January, 1870, a detailed proposal *for the Declaration of Papal Infallibility* was distributed by way of recommendation to the Fathers of the Council by eighteen Bishops of various lands, followed soon by another, from several prelates who were mainly Italians. At the same time, journals in Italy, France and England were agitating for this; the *Civiltà* and *Unità Cattolica, Univers, Monde, Correspondance de Rome, Dublin Review, Tablet, Vatican,* etc. Counter-propositions were at once opposed to these; and the Holy Father received respectful but reasoned representations from 45 Austrian or German Bishops, 38 French, 27 Americans, 17 from the East and 7 from Italy, beseeching that no definition of Papal Infallibility should be proposed to the Vatican Council." These three representations in Alzog, which run to two closely-printed pages, (530—32) are thus represented by the translators (pp. 239, 244) : " On the 20th of February, 1870, a *decree* was published, containing some further rules, which, while providing for full freedom of discussion, were designed to prevent irrelevant and useless controversy, to make the debates more orderly and direct, and to save time and expedite business. These just limitations gave offence to some, who regarded them as strictures on their freedom of speech and action; but it is difficult, on reading them over, to view them as other than wise regulations, admirably adapted for the guidance and government of such a body as the Vatican Council. The rules governing the debates in the American Congress or the British Parliament do not allow a wider liberty, and are not nearly so simple and precise.

"Some of the Bishops also thought that the provisions of the Constitution *Apostolicae Sedis moderationi,* signed by the Pope, October 12th, 1869, and published as a part of the *law* of the Church on the 14th of December, abrogating a number of *censures,* not applicable to the changed circumstances of these times, should have been incorporated in one of the *schemata,* and brought before the Council; and, because this was not done, a few began to express their fears that their freedom would be restrained. It is not easy to understand why the exercise of a papal prerogative, which at any other time would have excited no comment, should then be taken as indicating a purpose to control the action of an Œcumenical Council. . . . A counter-petition was also drafted and signed by about one hundred Bishops, asking that the question of Infallibility be not laid before the Council, on the ground that to define it would be both unwise and unseasonable, not that they disbelieved the doctrine itself."

Here, it will be seen, the author's meaning is falsified by barefaced contradiction, whenever mere suppression does not go far enough. Yet this policy is continued down to the very last paragraph of these two chapters; as serious an indictment could be drawn up against the later pages as against these which I have dealt with in detail. Among others, the words of Pius IX. are falsified, in a direction designed to mislead American and English readers on a point which the candidature of Governor Smith for the Presidency, and the present troubles in Malta, render particularly topical at the present moment. Pius assured the world that "the Papacy no longer dreams of the resurrection of *its arbitrary power* in the Middle Ages"; this is softened to "*the supremacy* exercised by it in the Middle Ages." There is a vast difference between the clear promise not to exercise *supremacy,* and the vaguer promise to forgo *arbitrary power;* for how many despots have there been who, where their interests were at stake, have confessed that the power they exercised was arbitrary?

(7.) The Council over, Alzog describes the present state of his Church in one country after another. In France he comes to the leader of the Catholic laity, Montalembert, who, as it is well known, had feared the Council, but died just before the pronouncement of the decree which he deplored.

Alzog, p. 553.	Pabisch & Byrne, p. 261.
"A deep gulf runs through one section of [French religious] journalism, as Montalembert declared in his obituary of Lacordaire, in which he said that 'he expected the Church would save herself by disavowing the mediæval tendencies of the *Civiltà Cattolica* and the *Univers.* And, to the no small astonishment [of	"*Montalembert,* in speaking of the death of Lacordaire, represented his dead friend as believing that both the *Civiltà Cattolica* and *L'Univers* were too mediæval in their tendencies, a charge which it is somewhat difficult to understand. On the 14th of April, 1872, Pius IX. reproved all editors who, in their ardent advocacy of a

the public], Pius IX. has lately done this (April 14th, 1872), though indeed in another connection, on account of their uncharitable extravagances.' "	cause, forgot the laws of charity."

This is enough—though a great deal more might be quoted if necessary—to show how these two American professors conceive their duty towards aspirants for the priesthood in the matter of historical truth. But I may conclude this chapter by quoting a case in which the English community are concerned; and in which the author, though he cannot be altogether acquitted, certainly seems less responsible than the hierarchy. The words in which I described it nearly two years ago have never, to my knowledge, been impugned; and I repeat them here.[9] The subject is St. Catharine of Siena's *Dialogue,* one of our most plain-spoken witnesses for the morality and estimation of the clergy in the later Middle Ages. " The ecclesiastically authorised translation of this book, published in 1906 by Mr. Algar Thorold with official Roman Catholic *imprimatur* from the Archbishop's House at Westminster, is one of those pieces of literary dishonesty which go far to justify Newman's and Lord Acton's warnings that we can hardly expect historical truth from a believer in Papal Infallibility, on questions where the Church's honour is thought to be at stake. The whole of chapters 121—130, 133, and 162—164—that is, nearly 36 close-printed quarto pages—are silently suppressed; and not only silently, but with deliberate disguise, for in this edition the numeration of the chapters is omitted, so that even a reader familiar with the original may waste a good deal of time before he discovers the fraud, while the ordinary reader can have no suspicion

[9] *Five Centuries of Religion,* Vol. II., pp. 554ff; cf. 569ff.

of it. The preface contains no hint; on the contrary, Mr. Thorold assures us that 'with facts, as such, there can indeed be no tampering'; 'my aim has been to translate as literally as possible'; again, 'I have almost always followed the text of Gigli, a learned Siennese ecclesiastic' and so on (pp. 2, 24). The title-page, indeed, does bear, among other announcements, 'a new and abridged edition'; but even careful readers do not always study title-pages; and, as a matter of fact, this word 'abridged' not only escaped my notice until I had wasted a great deal of time over the book, but it also passed unnoticed even by the cataloguers at the Cambridge University Library. It is in an author's Preface that we have a right to expect some confession, and some reasons given, for garbling a classical book.

"On comparing this cheap edition with its expensive predecessor (1896) and successor (1925), we see that these others bear no official *imprimatur,* that St. Catharine's judgments on the clergy are *not* suppressed, and that the translator can therefore afford to number his chapters as they are numbered in the original Italian, except that he omits the *Treatise of Providence,* presumably as being too dull. The saint's *Dialogue,* therefore, may be had either in an expensive and historically correct edition, or (as recommended by the hierarchy) in a cheap edition which, from the historical point of view, is quite shameless in its suppression of truth and suggestion of falsehood. For anyone who, for historical purposes, reads this cheap edition—this edition which the official Church commends to the faithful—will find himself as cruelly deceived as an African savage might be deceived by a trader who quoted the Ten Commandments as the watchword of European civilisation and took the liberty of omitting one single word in each case. In this volume, Mr. Thorold and his archiepiscopal patrons lead us carefully through St. Catharine's description of the model priest, and then quietly suppress the only chapters of real significance for actual history, in which the saint stigmatises the average priest or Religious of 1380 as contradicting, in almost every respect, what a priest or Religious ought to be. Here and there a sentence of frank criticism is allowed to stand in the other chapters; but, at a moderate computation, at least nine-tenths have been burked. Nor does it mend matters for the general public when we remind ourselves that there are many truthful Roman Catholics, lay folk and priests, who are as much distressed by these historical distortions as non-Romanists are provoked. Those better men are silent and powerless; it is of the essence of their Church that they should be powerless and silent in such cases as this; and it is behind these respectable and respected figures that the falsifier takes shelter. It is highly probable that Mr. Thorold himself did not cut those chapters out, nor deliberately cover his tracks by omitting chapter-numbers and retaining a misleading preface; very likely these things were done for him 'Westmonasterii,' as the *imprimatur*-page has it,—i.e. in the Archbishop's office. Let us not forget, again, that there are a certain number of English folk who may still read the real truth about the clergy and Religious of 1380, if they can afford to buy the expensive and ecclesiastically-unauthorised editions. But this, again, is only part of the same policy which teaches one sort of doctrine to the Italian peasant, and another sort to cultivated Germans or English-speaking people. It adds to the general confusion. If religious propaganda were always consistently obscurantist, and as easy to be exposed as in this present case, then the average puzzled reader would know better where he stood. At present, when he is shocked by the discovery of some startling falsehood, it is pleaded in excuse that some of these advocates, at some times, do really tell the naked truth. Meanwhile, we can only look forward to some more scrupulous generation, in which the man who would not dream of falsifying a cheque will as little condescend to falsify history."

CHAPTER XVIII.

PERSONAL EXPERIENCES.

FORTY-FIVE years ago, I happened to be examiner at a country Grammar School where the lowest form was taken by Frederick Rolfe, an interesting but eccentric young man without any university degree. He was one of the many Bohemians who become more famous in death than in life; his *Hadrian the Seventh* is in some ways a truly remarkable book; a very interesting article on him will be found in *Life and Letters* for July, 1928, and I could supply reminiscences equally strange from my memory and from my papers, unless they are lost. In that year, 1885, I sat smoking one or two evenings in his little room after work; and he told me he meant to take Orders in the Roman Church. His Anglicanism was falling away from him; he had read Littledale's *Plain Reasons,* and then passed on to the reply of Fr. Ryder, " who had wiped the floor with Littledale." Now, therefore, his doubts were dispelled; and he intended to choose an early date for abjuration of his errors. To me, as to his colleagues, this then seemed only one of his many eccentricities; but it gave me an interest in this controversy which had produced such an effect upon Rolfe. At a later date, I bought the two books, and read them with some care side by side.

The contrast in ability was certainly startling. It was rumoured, and the book seems to bear it out, that Ryder wrote with the help of his colleague and master in the Oratory, Newman. Certainly he managed his case in a manner which would have done no discredit to his master. Not only had Littledale been careless, so that he was compelled to abandon several of his assertions before his articles were published in book form, and some others, again, under further correction. But his facts and arguments were also badly arranged, so that Ryder could plausibly plead " I have not followed Dr. Littledale's arrangement, as I have failed to discover that this has been carried out upon any fixed principle; one detects certain pungent transitions of offensiveness, and that is all." Under cover of this plea, as I found when I began seriously to compare the two books, Ryder was able silently to evade all the worst difficulties. It takes great patience to assure oneself how small, in comparison, are the points on which he deals his brilliant thrusts, and how important are the positions which, meanwhile, he is tacitly abandoning. To cite Tyrrell's happy comparison once again, he produces the dog alive, and wins repute for his fellows as calumniated innocents.

As an instance of these evasions, let us take the crucial question of image-worship. Littledale quotes three passages from Origen. (First ed., p. 31; ed. 1919, p. 43); Ryder (p. 120) deals with only two of these, and explains them away airily as a mere " protest [by Origen] against anthropomorphism; against the idea that you 'can fashion likenesses of Divinity.' " This explanation does not fully meet even the two cases in question; and it is quite irrelevant to the third, in which Origen ridicules the idea that any sensible man should " imagine that by gazing on these natural things [such as images] he can ascend from the visible symbol to that which is spiritual and immaterial." Therefore Ryder passes this third and most important quotation in complete silence.

Littledale (1st ed., p. 163) quotes Keenan's catechism of 1846 and 1853, with its assertion that Papal Infallibility " is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the faith "; and he also alludes to the Gallican opposition. These are two of the most damning pieces of evidence against the Decree of 1870; and, therefore, Ryder discreetly avoids facing them. Neither

Keenan nor Bossuet, I believe, are even mentioned by him.

Littledale (1st ed., p, 108), gives instances where "Cardinal Wiseman . . . systematically quotes doubtful, spurious and forged writings of the Fathers as genuine." He proves the same against St. Alfonso Liguori, adding: "And if it be pleaded that Liguori erred through ignorance, the reply is that his editors do not correct him, though they, at any rate, know the facts." To this, Ryder replies (p. 196): "The honesty of St. Alfonso and of Cardinal Wiseman is called in question, because they have been convicted of quoting spurious patristic authorities. I suppose we may say of both that they were brought up in an uncritical school. It is by no means easy to wield vast learning like Cardinal Wiseman's, especially at the call of the moment, with perfect accuracy." Liguori's editors, that is, are tacitly excused altogether for reprinting falsehoods, and Wiseman is excused on the score of his "vast learning." It is almost as though Fr. Ryder felt, with M. Paul Desjardins, that the higher a man stands in the Roman hierarchy, the less we are likely to be able to trust his statements. And the whole passage is indexed: "Wiseman, Cardinal, *false charge against*" (italics mine). I say nothing here of the gross historical mis-statements to which Ryder commits himself here and there; in those matters he was probably more sinned against than sinning; a victim of the "uncritical school" which still reigns under shadow of the *Index Expurgatorius;* a typical example of what passes for Church history in his communion. But those omissions cannot be so excused; Origen and Keenan and Bossuet and Liguori and Wiseman are deliberately shirked, not because Fr. Ryder did not know, but because he knew only too well; not because they were mere matters of detail, but because they were fundamental flaws in his edifice; flaws which cunning arrangement might conceal, but which would have become apparent if he had followed Littledale step by step. He knew perfectly well, if only at the back of his mind, how definitely he had violated, on occasion, that rule which he claims on p. xv. of his preface: "a 'Reply' in detail, covering the whole of my adversary's ground, and as nearly as possible in the same form as the 'Plain Reasons.'"

Meanwhile, having turned to the systematic study of mediæval Church life, and especially of the Monasteries, I was at once brought up against Abbot (later, Cardinal) Gasquet's apologetic writings. One of his most sweeping and fundamental statements seemed not only unsupported by proper documentary evidence, but actually incompatible with documents which I knew fairly well. In his *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries* (Vol. I., 1888, p. 38), he had written: "Anything like general immorality was altogether unknown among the religious of England. This much is clearly proved by the testimony of the acts of episcopal visitations." For these visitation acts themselves there was only one quotation on p. 37, at second-hand from Dr. Oliver, and another brief reference in a footnote on p. 35. Otherwise, in this bulky book of 1,000 octavo pages, crammed with quotations, there is scarcely anything from the rich mass of episcopal registers. This struck me at once; and (without knowing that Bishop Creighton had already laid his finger on this weak spot in the *English Historical Review*) I resolved to extract some sort of references, if possible, from the author. My first letter (March 14th, 1901) remained unanswered: I therefore sent another, registered, on May 23rd. This time there was a brief acknowledgment, but no reference; the author was under doctor's orders. Waiting until I saw his name conspicuous again in the newspapers (Nov. 13th), I wrote for the third time, enclosing, as before, a paper which should have facilitated his reply. This was a list of the score of volumes of episcopal visitations or similar documents which I knew were accessible; I asked him to cross out those which he might not have read when he made that confident generalisation, and initial those which he had read and could rely upon to testify in his favour. The job might perhaps have taken him ten minutes; certainly no more. He replied, however, in ten lines: "It would take me more time than I could spare to go through my collections for *Henry VIII. and the Monasteries*—which were made many years ago—to do what you ask. At present I have not even got my note-book, made in several of the bishops' registry offices, at hand to refer to." This, of course, was merely irrelevant and evasive. No serious author could doubt whether or not he had read this or that volume of primary importance before writing his book; or, at least, such doubts could touch only a negligible fraction of the books read. I then saw plainly, what I had suspected all through, that Abbot Gasquet knew very little of any registers but what he had quoted at second-hand for a single diocese from Oliver (who himself had gone seriously astray over them) together with the few scraps, themselves often imperfect and misleading, which appeared in the rest of his book.

Meanwhile, a reviewer in the *Church Quarterly* pointed out an even more serious matter. The Abbot had published a book on *The Old English Bible* which was acclaimed by the Romanists as epoch-making and conclusive, and which, for a time, even impressed more serious critics. But the reviewer, analysing it carefully, exposed it as a tissue of inaccuracies, and laid special stress upon one fatal and quite inexplicable blunder. The Abbot had asserted (and built an argument upon the assertion) that "we shall look in vain, in the edition of Wycliffite Scriptures published by Forshall and Madden, for any trace of these errors"; i.e. of thirteen erroneous articles recorded in the episcopal registers of London, as discovered in the prologue to a Bible found in the possession of Richard Hun in 1514. Yet, in fact, all those thirteen propositions are in the Forshall and Madden Bible as they were in Hun's, and often in identical words. I need give only the first three as specimens; the other ten are equally recognisable: italics, of course, are mine:—

A. HUN'S BIBLE.	B. FORSHALL & MADDEN.
“i. First the said book damneth all holy canons, calling them *ceremonies and statutes of sinful men and uncunning,* and calleth the pope *Satan and Antichrist.*	“i. It semith opyn heresie to seie, that the Gospel with his treuthe and fredom suffisith not to salvacioun of cristen men with out kepying of *ceremonyes and statutis of sinful men and unkunnyinge,* that ben maad in the tyme of *Sathanas* and of *Antecrist* (p. 3).
“ii. Item, it damneth *the pope's pardons,* saying they be but *leasings.*	“ii. Summe cristene lordis senden general lettris to alle her mynistris, and leegemen either tenauntis, that the *pardouns of the bisschopis of Rome,* that ben opin *leesingis,* for thei graunten many c yeeris of pordoun aftir domesday, be prechid generaly in her rewmes and lordschipis (p. 30).
“iii. Item, the said book of Hun saith, that Kings and *lords,* called *Christian in name, and heathen in conditions, defile the Sanctuary of God, bringing clerks full of covetousness, heresy and malice, to stop God's law, that it cannot be known, kept, and freely preached.”*	“iii. Summe *cristene lordis in name, and hethene in condiscouns, defoulen the sentuarie of God,* and *bringin in symonient clerkis, ful of coveitise, eresie,* and ypocrisie, *and malice, to stoppe Goddis lawe, that it be not knowen, and kept, and frely prechid;* . . . . ” (p. 30).

It is a mystery how any man could profess to have read through the first fifty odd pages of Forshall and Madden without discovering these facts. But worse remains behind. Not only did the Abbot, who up to that point had been most vociferous in controversy, now ignore his critic, and retire into silence, but six years later, when a new edition of the work was called for—for of course the vast majority of the Romanists, never reading serious criticism, still took the book for gospel—the author actually set up the now patent falsehood in new type, together with others almost equally indefensible which had meanwhile been exposed, and republished them to the world. On p. 111 of the second edition, as on p. 129 of the first, the trusting reader is assured that " we shall look in vain in the edition of the Wycliffite Scriptures published by Forshall and Madden for any trace of these errors." There is not even a footnote to warn us that this assertion has ever been contested. And his preface adds, if possible, to the incomprehensibility of this proceeding. The Cardinal there writes: " With regard to the papers themselves, they are here reprinted without appreciable alteration. At one time I had entertained the design of adding a third essay to the two on the Pre-Reformation English Bible, which were much discussed at the time they first appeared, and the conclusions embodied in them were challenged in various quarters. Other occupations have prevented my carrying out this intention, and thus making use of the material which, since the original papers were published, has been growing under my hand—material which, to me at least, seems to strengthen my contention as to the Catholic origin of the version which it has hitherto been the fashion without much justification to attribute to Wyclif himself." It would be easy to fill many pages more with mis-statements almost as indefensible as this, which the Cardinal reprinted in cold blood with the same inexplicable disregard of ordinary literary decencies. One of the most conspicuous of his lapses was in 1922, when he was already Cardinal and Prefect of the Vatican Library and had been appointed President of the Papal Commission for the revision of the Vulgate Bible. He then reprinted a series of essays under the general title of *Monastic Life in the Middle Ages.* There, on pp. 72ff, we find a lengthy protest against Protestant libels, "that their Catholic ancestors were little better than idolaters," "that false and superstitious practices were encouraged and tolerated," and "that, by allowing this customary reverence [of 'creeping to the Cross'], the Church had given occasion for the growth of serious superstition among the common people, amounting in reality to practical idolatry." In support of this protest he produces a long quotation combining two passages from *Dives and Pauper* (about A.D 1400) in which the instructor carefully explains the difference between *Latria,* due to God, and *Dulia,* reverence which may be paid to creatures. Yet, even from this quotation, it might be inferred with some probability that the confusion against which the teacher protests was in fact frequent among common folk; and this is explicitly stated in a passage which comes between the Cardinal's two selections. There, the author says: "And this [extreme reverence to the cross, by gesture and in certain portions of the Liturgy] blindeth much people in their reading. For they mean that all the prayers that Holy Church maketh to the cross, that she maketh them to the tree that Christ died on, or else to the cross in the church, as in that anthem *O crux splendidior.* And so for lewdness they be deceived, and worship creatures as God Himself."[1] The Cardinal, therefore, has chosen out of a long passage of *Dives and Pauper* (giving no reference but leaving the reader to find it in this folio volume as best he can from the context) just one piece here, and another piece there, which lend some sort of colour to his contention; while even the most suspicious reader could scarcely guess that the three inconspicuous dots in the middle of his quotation, do, in fact, mark an omission which completely destroys his apologetic contention. Moreover, this suppression of references is his usual custom; so that the readers must track him, through this rare folio of *Dives and Pauper,* which can be found only in the greatest libraries, by such indications as they can find in the context of the quotation itself. And, in another place, he has garbled the text no less seriously (p. 83). The author quotes from Gratian's *Decretum* (the first volume of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*) how "On this place [a quotation from Augustine] the gloss showeth that it is more profitable to hear God's word in preaching than to hear any Mass, and that a man should rather forbear his Mass than his sermon." This is, in fact, a not unusual mediæval judgment. St. Bernardino of Siena, for instance, asserts it still more emphatically, and more than once (*Dom. I.ª in Quadrag,* c. 2; *Feria VI.ª post II. Dom. in Quadrag,* c. 1). But to the Cardinal, whom a Romanist journal of about twenty-five years ago described as "our only historian," the words of *Dives and Pauper* were simply incomprehensible as they stood. He, like nearly all Romanists. was hypnotised by the Romanist delusion that modern Popery is identical on all important points with the Catholicism of past ages. He knew that the Westminster Penny Catechism proclaims it a mortal sin to miss Mass on Sundays and holy-days of obligation, but not even these remarkable words in *Dives and Pauper* suggested to him to seek and find the truth which had been published a quarter of a century earlier by Duggan, a priest as pious as himself.[2] "What authority," asks Duggan, "is there for this [statement of the Penny Catechism]? Again, the authority of theologians but not the authority of the Church. No pope or council has defined that it is a mortal sin to miss Mass on a Sunday. . . . Yet it is universally taught amongst us, and believed, that to miss Mass once or to do servile work on Sunday for an hour or two without absolute necessity, is a mortal sin, and that a man deserves eternal punishment for that one sin. . . . Can good come from making people think things to be sins that are not sins? What we gain is that a few people come to Mass regularly who, perhaps, would not come so regularly. What we lose is that we warp the judgments of multitudes of men."

---

[1] Com. I., c. 4. (Ed. Berthelet, 1534, f. 15, v. °.) The three unusual words may easily be found in their proper mediæval sense in the *Oxford English Dictionary; reading* = interpretation; *mean* = think; *lewdness* = ignorance.

---

[2] *Steps Towards Reunion,* p. 44. The whole chapter is illuminating as to the pasteboard structure of this famous Penny Catechism.

The Cardinal, thus hypnotised by his Penny Catechism, is obliged to insert a footnote: "It will be unnecessary, of course, to remark that the author is not here speaking of the Mass of Obligation on Sundays and festivals, but of voluntary attendance at Masses of devotion." But how does he reconcile this, not only with Gratian and St. Bernardino, of whose words he evidently knows nothing (although, those words, "the gloss," might have suggested to him that the passage was based on Canon Law) but with the very text which he is annotating? When *Dives and Pauper* says plainly *any* Mass, how are we to take him as meaning "*not any* Mass, but only those which are least significant, and, therefore, least reconcilable with this emphatic word *any* which I am using"? The Cardinal's method is quite simple here; he garbles the text to suit his note, and prints not "*any* Mass" but quiet, unobtrusive, "*a* Mass!" For years this kind of thing went on; the falsifications passed easily, under cover of no references or inadequate references, among readers of whom perhaps one in a hundred was otherwise than candidly credulous, delighted to be told just the things that suited his own opinions, and even that hundredth was probably not within reach of the books quoted, or master of the Latin in which they were written. In the second edition of my *Mediæval Studies* (first series) I collected a list—doubtless, very incomplete—of the Cardinal's gross distortions of truth which had come under my own notice; and, the choice being now put before me of reprinting them in a third edition at the end of this year, I decided to do so for the same reasons which had decided me to this second edition. So long as important historical falsehoods are not withdrawn, but are still publicly circulated, so long will it be necessary to expose them no less publicly.

A few others, it is true, had felt the significance of the Cardinal's silence as strongly as myself. *The Times Literary Supplement* (Sept. 23rd, 1915) judged that the list of mis-statements and blunders which I had printed "certainly helps to justify" my severest criticisms, which it printed *in extenso*. The *Church Times* (July 15th, 1921) referred in a leader to my reiteration of the charges in my *Roman Catholic Church and the Bible,* which I published in protest against the sort of statement which we were likely to hear (and did in fact hear, when the time came) at the great Roman Catholic Bible Congress held at Cambridge in that year, when an abortive attempt was organised to procure honorary doctorates from the University for Cardinals Gasquet and Bourne. The writer of the leader said: "Mr. Coulton has put out a little pamphlet of thirty-six pages, entitled *The Roman Catholic Church and the Bible,* which will, in the windows of the Cambridge booksellers, attract the attention of Cambridge's visitors. He re-opens an old controversy with Cardinal Gasquet in such terms that it is difficult to see how the Cardinal can avoid replying. He makes a grave accusation against the Cardinal's literary reputation and honour, charging him with repeating a falsehood when its falsity had quite plainly been pointed out. Mr. Coulton prints again the details of the case, claiming that any reader who troubles to follow 'will realise how impossible it would be to match this in civilised modern society.' Certainly he seems to make out his case and to have proved that the Cardinal repeated an error in a new edition of *The Old English Bible* after his attention had been several times expressly called to it. It was not an unimportant error, for on it the argument of his essay depended. But one story is good till another is told. We find it almost incredible that Cardinal Gasquet should be guilty of deceiving his readers in such fashion. He must have an answer if he chooses to give it. And we submit that he should give it. His challenger is not an unimportant and irresponsible person; he is a scholar of real learning whose word on such a matter as this carries weight. Nor is the Cardinal a person without responsibility. He occupies a very distinguished position and, whether rightly or wrongly, if he is silent he will inevitably bring discredit upon the Church he serves. For these reasons we hope that the matter will be cleared up once for all at the coming Bible Congress. Silence seems no longer possible after Mr. Coulton's repetition of the charge. We welcome, then, the Cambridge Bible Congress. If Catholics and Protestants are united by a common love of the Bible and knowledge of it, the gulf between them will not be so deep. It will help to advance the cause of reunion. But let Cardinal Gasquet give Mr. Coulton satisfaction."

No answer whatever was made to this appeal, though the pamphlet ran through its first edition at Cambridge almost while the Congress was sitting.

The fact is that the author's private virtues, and his exalted rank, do but increase the actual mischief. For this Cardinal, while he lived, I had personal respect, apart from what revolted me in his histories. Watching him across the table in the Manuscript Room of the British Museum, I could not fail to see that he was a courteous gentleman, with the added dignity of one who has lived up to the clerical ideal. But it has always been a Christian motto that the private virtues of our adversaries must not blind us to whatever seems false in their teaching; one of the greatest difficulties of the orthodox apologist has often lain in the private virtues of pagan or heretic. Nor ought we to expose falsifications any the less unsparingly, because we may recognise that the slope was really very slippery; that mere carelessness and prejudice may have been the primary cause in every case, and that the worst revolts against the demand for correction of obvious blunders may be accounted for by that ingrained tradition among the Roman hierarchy of never publicly admitting error: "the thing isn't done among us!" To quote Paul Desjardins again; the higher a prelate, the less you can trust his word on these points of hottest religious dispute.

For there is no sign as yet of any public retractation, even where the falsehood is so obvious as in this case of Hun's Bible. I have heard admissions from individual Roman Catholics that they are not blind to these inaccuracies; but my interlocutors have ended with a silent shrug of the shoulders. What can they do, in the face of a multitude which requires, above all, to be humoured and "edified," and of a hierarchy which, in its uncritical prejudice if not with more deliberate purpose, actually patronises pious falsehoods? The Cardinal claimed, and no doubt truly, that it was his historical writings which had earned him the purple. The *Catholic Times* is able to say: "Only a few men can obtain a secure reputation for solidity and fidelity, and among these happy ones Gasquet must be numbered. . . . . . His historical writings are always a pleasure and a profit to read." Another journal assures us: "The literary services of Cardinal Gasquet to the Papacy will rank historically as one of the Vatican's most valuable assets during our own generation. Since the time, now some forty years ago, that he was elected Prior of St. Gregory's Monastery, Downside, he has rewritten history from the Roman Catholic point of view with a breadth of judgment and a wise discrimination which have commended themselves to every class of ecclesiastical and social student." It is quite necessary, therefore, to emphasise the very unfavourable light which all this casts upon Romanist historiography. Nor do we here take advantage of our author's silence in the grave, seeing that for nearly thirty years of life he remained equally silent in face of urgent appeals for an explanation, and that he has left so many comrades who would be only too glad to expose any inaccuracy in our own criticisms. As it stands, few modern writers have illustrated the devastating effect of the censorship system, and of that sectarianism which passes from mouth to mouth the current catchwords of its own restricted area, imagining itself all the while to be giving law to the world, than this dignified ecclesiastic who was tempted into history, and who found in a laborious predecessor like Canon Dixon, and in the real learning of Edmund Bishop, such easy materials to his hand.

One writer, even in the Cardinal's lifetime, did attempt to defend his accuracy; this was Mr. Egerton Beck, who was then, and perhaps still is, President of the principal Romanist Historical Society, which claims the patronage of St. Thomas Aquinas. In the Jesuit *Month* for August, 1921, he printed an article on "Mr. G. G. Coulton and Monastic Morality." In this, despite the broad implications of its title, he not only confined himself but, under criticism, claimed the right of confining himself, to one single point of dispute between the Cardinal and myself: he contended that "Cardinal Gasquet is amply justified in claiming the Registers as witnesses favourable to the monks." Since *The Month* systematically refuses to print protests, lest the faith of its subscribers should be shaken, I had to reply to Mr. Beck first through the post and then, at his choice, in the columns of *The Tablet.* All my part of the correspondence is printed in my fifteenth *Mediæval Study;* "More Roman Catholic History."[3] Like nearly all his fellows, Mr. Beck refused to allow me to reprint his own letters, which I was therefore only able to summarise. They will be found in *The Tablet* of Oct. 8th and 29th; compare his article of April 29th, 1922, with my acknowledgment in the fifteenth *Study* of two slips of my own. His capacity to deal with the general question, and the success of his defence of the Cardinal, may be estimated from what the reader will find in my fifteenth *Study*. But one point demands special notice here. Mr. Beck accused me of false witness with regard to two nunneries, because he himself could not find the facts which I had alleged from Archbishop Lee's *Register*. I replied that the facts were there recorded, exactly as I had stated them. He rejoined that, since he could not discover them there, he anticipated I might presently have to confess another "indefensible error," (by which quotation he conveyed a sneer at me for having frankly confessed and characterised as an indefensible error, and printed without delay on an erratum-slip, the one important mis-statement which he had discovered in all that I had written). I could only reply that, if he looked at the preface to the book we were discussing, he would find the editor summing up exactly as I did. He answered loftily (*Tablet*, Oct. 8th): "There is nothing confirmatory in the documents. Experience has made me distrustful of anything but official documents; and I paid no attention to the editor's summary, even if I read it." I then fell back upon a resource degrading indeed, from some points of view, but which, by experience, I now know to be the only possible way with certain Romanist controversialists. In *The Tablet* of Oct. 22nd, after indicating the seven separate pages of the Register on which he would find the documents of which he had twice denied the existence, I continued: "The documents themselves are so transparently clear that I cannot understand Mr. Beck's attitude when once his attention had been called to them. Since, however, he still persists in his serious accusation against me, I must resort to a test which has served me effectively once before. Let us each send you a cheque for £5, and leave you to choose a responsible umpire who, under his own name, will report in your paper whether my enumeration is right on pp. 90—1 of my *Mediæval Studies* or Mr. Beck's on p. 5 of *The Month*, where he flatly contradicts me. Let the umpire return one cheque to the party in whose favour he decides, keep £1 for his half-hour's trouble in verifying the documents, and hand over the £4 to any hospital you yourself may choose. If I might venture to suggest a name, Dom Bede Camm is one who, like myself, bears a certain public responsibility to Cambridge University for his published pronouncements." This challenge was, in fact, the application of mediæval methods to a person of mediæval mentality. A University Statute of Padua, in the fifteenth century, complains that the University is being ruined by the students' indifference to perjury, and enacts that, henceforth wherever the phrase "under pain of [condemnation for] perjury" occurs in the Statutes, there shall henceforth be substituted "a fine of five pounds, and loss of vote for a year." Again, an Oxford statute of 1432 deplores the futility of excommunication, and emphasises the value of "the pecuniary penalty, which in these days is feared more than any other."[4] Under pain of losing £5, Mr. Beck at last saw and confessed his mis-statements (Oct. 29th), explaining now that he had been misled by the Editor's headlines, and had never read through the actual text, even while he was claiming to rely on nothing but the original documents! In that same letter, Mr. Beck passed on to make what amounted to a fresh misstatement about me, claiming at the same time that this was "the main issue"; and the Editor added: "This correspondence may now cease." I therefore wrote the following protest, which I begged him to print in order that readers might be able to hear my

---

[3] Simpkin Marshall, Ltd. 1/6 net.

[4] H. Rashdall, *Hist. Universities*, Vol. II., p. 689; *Munimenta Academica* (R.S.), p. 305.

answer without further trespass on his space (Oct. 31st). "I sympathise with your feeling that the three points have been sufficiently discussed; but you have allowed Mr. Beck to pass beyond them into a whole paragraph of extraneous matter, which he now claims as the real question at issue between us, and on which I have no chance of reply. May I therefore say that I have already answered these arguments through the twopenny post, that I am printing my letters (he does not allow me to print his) and that any reader of *The Tablet* may procure a copy gratis by sending a stamped and addressed wrapper, between now and Nov. 19th to the Wessex Press, Taunton."

The Editor declined to print this. Mr. Beck, I need hardly say, took every opportunity afterwards of reviling me in his own sectarian press. He invented a legend of a riot in my classroom at Cambridge, which, my lawyer advised me, amounted clearly to a libel; it was published in *The Dublin Review*. With some difficulty I traced the origin of the story, by the kind help of one of the Roman Catholic pupils in my class; and this pupil himself wrote to assure Mr. Beck that he was mistaken. For some time I was determined to bring the matter into court, as I certainly should have done but that a trial, however successful, would have rendered it impossible for me to do anything like my full term's lecturing work at Cambridge. The Editor refused to print even two or three lines assuring his readers that I had Roman Catholic evidence against this Romanist libel. Finally, in concert with Mr. Beck, he concocted and printed the following (*Dublin Review*, Oct., 1922, p. 320) :—

" Mr. Coulton regards this as an attack on his professional position as a teacher of history, but he is under a misapprehension. The review, written by a Catholic for Catholic readers, appeared in a Catholic magazine, and the object of the writer was to protest against Mr. Coulton's mental attitude in regard to entirely Catholic subjects. There was no attack on his capacity or success as a teacher of history; the only point taken was his anti-Catholic tendency. Our reviewer explains that he had in his mind an occasion on which several Catholic undergrads noisily expressed their disagreement with one of Mr. Coulton's statements; their method, however, does not appear to have made their feeling clear to him."

My only response, here, was to write to Mr. Beck, confessing that he and the Editor had successfully calculated my difficulties in actually bringing their libel into court, and adding: "I am disarmed by your plea that your creed and your public excuse things which would otherwise be inexcusable." Mr. Beck replied (Nov. 6th): "You have, quite characteristically, distorted the plain meaning of the words you quote from the current number of *The Dublin Review*. But if you still wish your answer to appear in that magazine, and will give me an approximate idea of its length, I will ask the Editor to insert it as a personal favour to myself." I replied asking for four pages of reply to the four pages of attack, and offering to submit to ordinary editorial censorship over my language; pointing out, in addition, that the attack had been so phrased as to make readers believe that silence on my part might be taken as a confession of guilt. The Editor, I need hardly say, refused flatly. For *The Dublin Review* is and always has been a "Catholic Review" written by "Catholics" for "Catholic readers"; and things which would be disgraceful elsewhere are there in their natural place.

Finally, Mr. Beck publicly accused me of dishonesty in my exposure of Cardinal Gasquet's manipulation of the *Dives and Pauper* texts (*Dublin Review*, July—Sept., 1922, p. 150). In his last paragraph he wrote: "If we are wrong, an apology will be due to Mr. Coulton, and he shall have an ample one; but only on one condition, that he produces the text on which he relies—a text which would be so amazing that he would certainly find no difficulty in securing its insertion in the Catholic press. Till that time, which will probably be somewhere about the Greek Kalends, he must forgive us if we regard him as a merely pedantic Sciolist, whose word carries no weight in matters pertaining to the Catholic Church." I was ready, in fact, with the required texts not only from *Dives and Pauper,* but from the *Corpus Juris Canonici;* to which I am now in a position to add St. Bernardino of Siena, who twice recurs to the point in dispute (*Dom. I.*ª *in Quad.* Serm. X., c. 2; *Feria VI.*ª *Post Dom. in Quad.* Serm. XXIII., c. 1). But these, unfortunately, were too "amazing" to "secure insertion in the Catholic Press." It would doubtless have been too painful to find mediæval saints contradicting the Westminster Penny Catechism; therefore, in spite of the Editor's implied promise to print my evidence—for every Editor is at least bound by the explicit promises of his reviewer—I was again refused a hearing, on that consistent principle that Romanists have a right to regard nobody but the Romanist public and nothing but Romanist values. The Editor blandly told me to carry the discussion into *The Nation and Athenæum,* where it would not offend the susceptibilities of his own particular readers. I did so; and in that journal it transpired that Mr. Beck's accusations of dishonesty against me rested on his own ignorance of three very ordinary Middle English words! (Nov. 18th, 1922.) Such, then, are the moral and mental qualifications for becoming President of the Society of St. Thomas, and a light to lighten the Romanists in history!

CHAPTER XIX.

FURTHER EXPERIENCES.

In 1901, a book was published under the apt title of *Faith and Folly* by Mgr. J. S. Vaughan, brother to the Cardinal Archbishop. On p. 454 of that very aptly-named volume, he printed statistics designed to show an overwhelming preponderance of illegitimate births in Protestant countries. The Editor of the *Catholic Times* challenged me to face these statistics, and I had no difficulty in showing that the good Prelate had obtained his favourable average by omitting altogether from his calculations *the three best Protestant countries* on the one hand, and *the four worst Catholic* on the other; moreover, even among the twelve names which remained after all this juggling, he improved his results by counting Prussia and Germany as separate States ![1] Incredible as this may seem, still more incredible was his answer in the *Catholic Times* when I pointed it out. He found nothing better to plead than that all statistics are one degree worse than "d——d lies,"[2] quite forgetting that in *Faith and Folly* he had undertaken to prove the superiority of Romanist morality with no other argument than three bare tables of statistics, after which he had added, in triumph, "the above are surely eloquent enough." I pointed out this strange inconsistency; he vouchsafed no further explanation, and there the debate ended. A year later, however, this same Monsignor Vaughan wrote to the *Spectator,* accusing Protestants of composing history from tainted sources (August 30th, 1902); I, therefore, wrote in my turn recounting the *Faith and Folly* incident. Here, again, the distinguished Prelate relapsed into silence, though one of his co-religionists publicly confessed the shame and indignation which honest Romanists naturally feel at such exposures. But, on the other hand, the Secretary of the *Catholic Truth Society* came into the lists against me. I had spoken of this Society (trying at the same time to avoid unnecessary offence by bracketing it with an Anglican organisation which I knew to be immeasurably more truthful),as responsible for spreading partisan and misleading views of Church history. The Secretary, misrepresenting my words, challenged me to quote any false historical statement from the whole list of the society's pamphlets, and added that a pamphlet had once been honourably withdrawn in deference to such representations. Thus challenged, I replied by naming three of their most popular pamphlets which I knew, off-hand, to contain historical falsehoods: Father Coupe's *Infallibility,* Father Rickaby's *Persecution,* and Canon Foran's *Monks and Nuns.* I pointed out, as fully as possible within my limited space, the nature of those falsehoods; but, seeing that no secular periodical has room for anything like an adequate discussion of such questions, seeing again that nothing would be gained if we simply exchanged the lie courteous without producing the necessary evidence on both sides, I offered to the secretary or his friends such facilities for proving their innocence as the *Spectator,* in the nature of the case, could not afford. I promised that if he, or any writer for the *Catholic Truth Society,* cared to take the matter up, I would correspond privately with them on the subject, within certain reasonable limits of time and space, and then print the correspondence, whatever might be its issue, at my own expense. This challenge, however favourable to their contentions, was studiously avoided. Father Gerard did, indeed, attempt to transfer the discussion to the columns of the Romanist *Tablet,* but I declined to waste my time in such a debate unless the Editor would guarantee to grant me the same opportunities of free discussion which I had offered to my opponents, and not to cut me short, like his colleague of the *Catholic Times,* at a critical moment. As the Editor gave no such guarantee, and Father Gerard declined to risk himself upon the neutral ground which I offered at my own expense, this matter again dropped.[3] But when I recounted this story, with others, in *The Contemporary Review* for Dec., 1905, and again challenged Fr. Gerard to meet me on neutral ground, he again avoided taking me literally, and attacked me in *The Tablet.* This time I followed him upon his own ground; the whole of my letters are reprinted in *Catholic Truth and Historical Truth:* he deliberately refused me permission to print his, which would have clinched the matter still more clearly. Yet any reader who has the patience to follow my answers will see how, while accusing me of a blunder in German, he had, in fact, fallen himself into a schoolboy's mistake; how, while we were professedly discussing the question of monastic morality from original documents, he quoted not one single original, but fell back entirely upon modern authors; and, most important of all, how he dealt with this religious discussion in a spirit of dishonesty which was foreign to his natural character; for a friend who knew him well described him to me as a gentleman and a sportsman. He had set a clumsy trap for me, which he betrayed when he thought he had caught me, yet denied altogether, in the teeth of the most tell-tale facts and of his own triumphant exclamation, when he discovered that it was not I, but he, who had blundered in German, and that he was hoist with his own petard.

---

[1] Since mis-statements on this subject are very commonly printed, it may be well to note here that the *Statesman's Year-book* for 1900, giving all available figures throughout the world, shows Roman Catholic illegitimate births at a rate of 80·4 per thousand, and Protestant at 73·7. The figures will be found very nearly the same in other years which I have examined.

[2] This phrase is, of course, not mine, but his.

---

[3] This whole story, with the next, is fully told in my *Catholic Truth and Historical Truth.* (Simpkin Marshall, Ltd.

And, untaught by this experience, he printed at a later stage what was tantamount to a clear falsehood, little suspecting that I possessed a letter with which I was able to mark the contradiction between Fr. Gerard's public plea and the facts well known privately to Fr. Gerard.

In this same pamphlet, again, the reader may find my experience with the Jesuit Fr. Rickaby, of Oxford. This writer, in his public printed lectures, asserted that Protestants disclaimed moral responsibility "to *God* or man" for their beliefs. I wrote to the Jesuit *Month* to point out that the word which I here italicise constituted not only a libel but an absurdity; that all the Christians admit full responsibility to *God* for all their thoughts, however some of us may repudiate the right of any *man* to dictate to us. *The Month* replied that it did not print letters, but would send mine to the writer for an answer. Fr. Rickaby then wrote me a letter of almost incredible absurdity, with quotations which, in so far as they were relevant, destroyed his own case. This letter, and his next, he steadily refused to allow me to publish, claiming against all reality that they were private: my own share in the correspondence may be found in *Catholic Truth and Historical Truth.* Here, again, I had occasion to note that Fr. Rickaby's apparent insensibility to the ordinary demands of open intercourse between man and man on questions of religious discussion "is all the more strange because Father Rickaby is not only one of the intellectual pillars of the Roman Church in England, but also, to judge from his letters, a good and kindly man in his private life."

In 1905, again, the Dominican Fr. W. Lescher professed to take advantage of my promise to "offer four pages, in each [of my *Mediæval Studies*] to any competent critic who will undertake to convict [me] of serious error." After the exchange of four letters each, he sent me an essay so little to the real point (the defence of Abbot Gasquet against my first *Study*) that he himself acceded to my suggestion that it was not worth printing. I printed, however, his other letters, in a leaflet called *Popular Romanist Church History,* which shall be forwarded free to any reader of this chapter who cares to send a stamped and addressed envelope.

Father Herbert Thurston is one of the oldest and most experienced of Jesuit controversialists. In 1909 he wrote in his own *Month* an attack of which the plain sense was that readers must not trust the late Dr. H. C. Lea or myself, since we relied to so great an extent upon " cantankerous and censorious gossips " and upon the loose tales of Chaucer and Boccaccio. This being categorically and demonstrably false, I wrote a brief protest to *The Month,* which refused publication, as also did *The Tablet,* until a fortunate chance rendered further refusal almost impossible. Fr. Thurston made no attempt to produce the loose tales upon which I had relied, or to meet my protest that the mediæval authors from which I drew my main evidence were " all of them orthodox Roman Catholics of greater distinction than any now living in Great Britain: to assert the contrary is to bear false witness."[4] Nor did he apologise for this slander; he tried to wriggle out by arguing that it mattered nothing to his argument whether the conduct he ascribed to me was true of " Dr. Lea or Mr. Coulton or Mr. G. M. Trevelyan or one of the many other people I have in mind." In other words, " Catholic Truth " justifies our bearing false witness against any non-Romanist, so long as we have " other people in mind " of whom it may be possibly—though very doubtfully—true.

From that time forward I felt I had Fr. Thurston's measure. When, on the appearance of my *Mediæval Village,* he reviewed it in an Irish journal, I replied by admitting at once a wrong page-reference—due to defective printing in an old book and to difficult eyesight—and by challenging him to maintain under criticism the other nine points upon which he attacked me. They were sufficiently simple for me to suggest the money-test which had succeeded with Mr. Egerton Beck: as to the umpire, I wrote, "You may choose any Professor of Latin or of History you like, at any University in England, Scotland or Wales." He made no reply to this challenge; but, by way of later explanation to the public, he pleaded that to him, as a Religious, his Church forbade the possession of money, therefore "I am debarred, much to my regret, from accepting it owing to lack of funds." I need hardly point out that, if he had had any real hope of getting a public verdict against me, by any Professor even of his own choice, zealous ladies and laymen would have been only too glad to supply far more than the modest ten pounds which I was willing to risk.

---

[4] See pp. 43 and 47 of the third edition of my *Roman Catholic Church and the Bible,* where I print the actual letters.

I am justified in insisting on the transparent insincerity of this excuse by what happened later. A personal attack upon me caused me to quote this story in the *Western Morning News;* this resulted in a very long correspondence with Fr. Thurston which, as I have printed it in full, may be very briefly summarised here.[5] I pointed out how, "in the last seventeen years," that is, since Fr. Lescher "only one has accepted my offer to print anything which a responsible Roman Catholic has to say, *under cross-examination,* against the general accuracy of my writings."[6] But, as Fr. Thurston now implied (p. 11) that he was willing publicly to discuss the nine points on which he had accused me in his Irish paper, I challenged him to make good his word. He replied (p. 12) that he was ready to do so "on condition that all the arrangements were in the hands of some competent third party and not in

---

[5] *Roman Catholic and Anglican Accuracy.* (Simpkin Marshall, Ltd. 6d. net.)

[6] Fr. Leslie Walker, S.J., to whom we shall come presently.

Dr. Coulton's . . . some such well known scholar as, say, Professor Claude Jenkins or Professor Whitney or Professor Tout or Dr. Workman." Nothing could seem fairer than this offer; so I turned at once to my nearest neighbour of these four, and obtained Professor Whitney's consent to act as Fr. Thurston suggested (p. 13). His reply was startling; he now refused the discussion (p. 15), giving six reasons, of which every one was patently false (p. 16). One of these, in spite of my pointing out that it was a pure fiction, he repeated later (pp. 22, 23). Later again, in order to justify his refusal, he invented another fiction, and made no answer to my exposure of it (pp. 24, 25). At a still later stage, in a Cambridge paper, he suggested that I should choose as umpire between us some "learned professor of history." Here again, I at once secured the promise of a professor to judge between us, but this time I added: "There must be one common sense condition. When Fr. Thurston previously suggested Professor Whitney for a similar office, and when Professor Whitney had most reluctantly accepted the task, as a matter of pure duty, then Fr. Thurston at once retracted his challenge. I must, therefore, guard myself and my friends (by a precaution which would never have occurred to me before my experience of this incident) against another merely vexatious runaway knock. I hereby pledge myself, in case the arbitrator decides against me on this question, to allow Fr. Thurston to publish as my confession: 'I accept this award as final, and I regret having maintained, in this *Western Morning News*' discussion, a position which I now find to be untenable.' At the same time, I must ask Fr. Thurston to pledge himself unequivocally to the same form of words. Readers will easily see that I cannot again decently expose responsible teachers at this University to the inconvenience to which Professor Whitney was subjected; and indeed, if Fr. Thurston's confidence is not merely affected, he will catch as gladly as I do at this chance of vindicating the substantial accuracy of his (or my) assertions." Once again, and this made the third time within a few weeks, he refused a test which he had given every public appearance of welcoming.

One of his excuses was, that I intended to publish our correspondence only partially, in so far as it was favourable to myself. It made no difference to his attitude when I repudiated this unequivocally, and he was unable to produce the slightest evidence that I had ever planned such palpable injustice. Yet, while he falsely accused me of proposing "a controversial discussion under what is virtually the editorship of one of the disputants," and explained "the idea . . . has never attracted me," he himself, *in that very same letter*, explained that he was about to publish a booklet of his own, including "*some* extracts from this correspondence" (italics mine), and also such other documents as he alone might see fit to choose. This he presently proceeded to do, under the title of *Some Inexactitudes of Mr. G. G. Coulton,* and I had the satisfaction of lending his booklet, together with my own pamphlet containing the *whole* correspondence, to the class of elementary school teachers to whom I happened to be lecturing in London that term. I only directed their attention to the fact that Fr. Thurston's "some extracts" stopped short exactly at the point where I nailed down six of his mis-statements to the counter, and challenged him to accept the Editor's arbitration as to their accuracy. Anybody with sufficient curiosity may verify all this by spending a shilling on Fr. Thurston's booklet, and sixpence on my reprint of all our letters, with the sequel to this discussion elsewhere. I cannot recommend them as interesting reading, or as instructive on any point but one; since the detail on which I began, and from which he resolutely refused to pass on to any other, was ludicrously insignificant in itself. As I pointed out in the discussion, it was intrinsically as unimportant as Adam's and Eve's apple; but here, as there, the importance lay in his reaction to it. It proves beyond all tergiversation how far even one of the most distinguished Jesuits is willing to go, when the hard facts leave him no other alternative, in omission of the real points at issue, in fabrication of excuses, and in persistent avoidance of confession or reparation when those excuses are proved to be not only injurious to an opponent's reputation, but even imaginary from the bottom upwards.

An almost equally well known Jesuit is Fr. Leslie Walker, head of their hostel at Oxford, with whom I can deal more briefly. He attacked an article of mine, and took up my standing offer, to anyone of proved competence, to criticise my statements at my own expense. The result was a pamphlet entitled *Roman Catholic Truth,* which I have published as the seventeenth of my *Mediæval Studies,* and have followed up part of the argument, for which there was no room under our space-agreement, in the eighteenth *(The Death Penalty for Heresy).* He had begun by exposing a very careless translation of mine, for which I at once apologised, while pointing out that it did not affect my main argument. But, though our discussion was ostensibly about the comparative truthfulness of Romanist and other writers, and though I pressed upon him the plain adverse judgments of Newman and Acton, he declined to face this, the most important perhaps of all the points that emerged. Again, he insisted upon believing, as against me, the assertion of his fellow-Jesuit, Fr. Rickaby, that the letters which he refused to allow me to print were, in fact, private letters. He wrote to me by the post (Feb. 13th, 1924): "I cannot agree to the publication of your letters to Fr. Rickaby in our pamphlet, since I have not seen the letters to which they are a reply." Therefore, I begged him to send some trustworthy Roman Catholic in Cambridge to my rooms, to see these Rickaby letters and judge whether they were not ordinary controversial letters in public criticisms which had been sent to two Roman Catholic papers. The matter might thus have been set at rest; but Fr. Walker preferred the controversial advantage which he could gain by continuing to disbelieve me and refusing to accept this proffered evidence. I therefore replied by the post (Feb. 21st): "As to the letters [from me to Fr. Rickaby] I must print them in a way that will, in my opinion, be of less use either to you or to me or to the reading public. If you had seen them—and I offered you to send any friend here to look at them—I do not think you would continue to say what I am obliged deliberately to call 'the thing that is not,'" that is, that Fr. Rickaby's letters to me were private in any real sense which would justify his persistent refusal to allow their publication. I had already warned him (Jan. 30th) "there is nothing, either in the letter or in the spirit of the agreement, to prevent my printing *elsewhere* the evidence which restrictions of space will have precluded me from printing in our pamphlet." Fr. Walker wrote on Feb. 28th: "*Re Fr. Rickaby's letters.* Had I WANTED to see them, I should have *asked* for copies. Had you WANTED me to see them you would have *sent* copies. I consider your printing of this fly-sheet an unfair attempt to get the last word, contrary to our agreement, which I have faithfully kept to throughout. I have nothing more to say about this most unpleasant matter." My last words in my pamphlet were (p. 50): "*Father Rickaby's 'private' letter* (§ § 171, 195). Anyone sending stamped envelope to the Wessex Press, Taunton, may obtain documentary test of Fr. Walker's accuracy." His last words were: "I regret also that by the ingenious device of a fly-sheet my adversary has contrived after all to evade our agreement (§ 2. 2) and to secure the last word." That paragraph of our agreement ran: "After these two summaries, the pamphlet to be printed by Mr. Coulton shall end without a word more from either side." That paragraph, like nearly all the rest, was proposed by myself, not by Fr. Walker; though I was bearing the whole expense of printing, of which I knew

I should never recover more than a fraction, I offered terms which no Roman Catholic would dream of granting to me. Fr. Walker's obstinate refusal to verify whether Fr. Rickaby was deceiving the public about these letters, or I, compelled me to take the question into another court, unless I was to drop it altogether and leave it a mere case of one man's flat assertion against another's. For, though the printing of my own letters in reply to Fr. Rickaby might have enlightened readers, and I therefore asked leave to bring them in, yet by this time our stipulated space was nearly out, and he, who for once had agreed to an equal extension of that space for each of us, now refused to extend any more; it was therefore physically impossible for me to produce such evidence as I was otherwise free to produce, i.e. my own letters of reply. I therefore printed them in this separate fly-sheet together with a note by Dr. W. R. Sorley, our Knightsbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy, whom I had asked as an unexceptionable judge to examine Fr. Rickaby's autograph letters and arbitrate between us. He wrote:—

"I have read the letter written by Fr. Rickaby to Mr. Coulton in February, 1902, and the memorandum enclosed in that letter. There is nothing in either which can be described as 'private' in the ordinary usage of that term. The memorandum which accompanied the letter consists entirely of certain references to books and some general considerations intended to justify the assertion to which Mr. Coulton had taken exception.

21st Feb., 1924. W. R. Sorley."

This, and the fact that I made another of the matters disputed between us the subject of a separate pamphlet later on *(The Death Penalty for Heresy)* has been exploited by Fr. Walker as a breach of faith on my part. It is in vain that I have pointed out to him how, in our pamphlet, he was given exactly the same space as myself, to be printed at my own expense, in order to justify my conviction that his criticisms did not touch the most serious accusations in my essay. He persists in assuming that, by promising him of my own accord equal space, and the advantage of dividing the last word equally, *in the pamphlet,* I was in some way bound in honour never to recur to the subject *outside those limits,* even in defence of what amounted to a false imputation upon my veracity, or of my attitude on the wide historical question of Roman intolerance, for which the pamphlet itself soon proved too narrow. He has accused me, both directly and through his friends, of having inserted that leaflet in the pamphlet itself. This I have publicly denied, and demanded evidence for it, which nobody has attempted to supply (e.g. *Church Times,* March 28th, 1930). As it happens, no single reader, to my recollection, ever wrote to me for the leaflet in response to those last words of my pamphlet, a fact which seemed to me to indicate that they realised I should not thus have offered public evidence if I had not been confident of the truth of my own assertion. The leaflets have been stowed in my loft; two removals have worked havoc among them as among many other papers, but there are still a few dozen remaining at the disposal of anybody who has curiosity enough to risk a stamped and addressed envelope. The matter, in itself, is ludicrously small, yet it illustrates that Jesuit policy exposed by Tyrrell, of producing the dog alive and thus hoping to avoid explaining the death of three men. Fr. Rickaby, prominent among Jesuit controversialists, makes a statement first in public lectures and then in print, which is criticised publicly by another man. He answers that man in a letter of elaborate historical argument, which to the other seems astoundingly ignorant and false in logic. But he shelters himself from the consequences by pleading that, since the letter went through the post, it was private; and his critic has finally no means of bringing out the real truth but by methods upon which another Jesuit, misrepresenting the attendant facts and making an assertion which he cannot sustain, bases an accusation of dishonourable conduct!

Fr. Walker himself has more than once recurred to this subject, in the *Yorkshire Post,* the *Dublin Review* and the *Catholic World,* attempting to explain what he carefully avoided in our pamphlet, the reasons why Newman and Acton complained of Romanist historical mendacity with a vehemence which, from a Protestant pen, would be characterised as a display of bigotry. His pleas seemed so untenable that, having no chance of reply in those two Romanist papers, I answered in the *Modern Churchman,* having first obtained a promise from the Editor to give Fr. Walker not only equal space, but the last word. He flatly declined, finding it more convenient to revile me from his own trenches, and to tell the public that he hated controversy. I therefore dealt with his arguments in a sixpenny pamphlet under the title of *Roman Catholic History.* Since that, we have again met each other in public print; (*Church Times,* March 21st and 28th, 1930). The two letters will be found in my Appendix.

It will be seen that there is one common factor in the monotonous story which has filled these two chapters. In every case we have a man prominent in the Roman Church, respectable in all other relations of life but one, yet, in the one field where interests of his Church seem to be at stake, painfully untrustworthy. In the field of Church history, where (as the great Benedictine Mabillon insisted) strict truth is even more due to the public than in all other domains of history, something intervenes and turns Father Jekyll into Father Hyde. Newman saw this clearly, and confessed it to an intimate friend; Acton saw it and confessed it still more plainly; no Protestant of equal distinction has ever passed such a terrible judgment upon Roman Church history as those two. It seems impossible to escape from the conclusion that what forces these otherwise respectable men into courses so difficult to characterise in temperate words is some fatal weakness in the system which they are professionally pledged to defend. As far as possible, they avoid coming to real grips with the worst difficulties. Probably some of them scarcely face those difficulties even in their own minds. Certainly the most successful show extraordinary skill in avoiding, while they appear to grasp, the real problem; and the censorship system, with the mental habits which it breeds both in Romanist writers and in the Romanist public, is of the greatest assistance to those who must needs answer plausibly, yet dare not answer frankly. But there are occasions where no evasion or subterfuge can avail; and then, with his back to the wall, Father Smith will reprint some assertion which has been proved patently false, or will deliberately mistranslate an author whom in his preface he has promised to render with the utmost good faith. And, as likely as not, he will be a main pillar of what styles itself the Catholic Truth Society.

For a time, these tactics are successful whenever the controversialist is clever enough at his own job. The falsehood will often last for a generation; and then, when it is finally discredited, it will be buried; "why rake up old grievances? let byegones be byegones." Certain Catholic Truth Society pamphlets are already unprocurable; there has been no open retractation or apology, but they have quietly disappeared. Father Furniss' *Books for Children,* of which four million copies were perhaps sold in my lifetime, have been so systematically destroyed that it is difficult nowadays to raise a copy, even in Ireland, at any price. The *Catholic Encyclopædia,* while dropping a single passing hint of his "somewhat lurid eschatology," will tell you that the good Father "entered fully into the mode of thought of the child-mind. . . . He spent his spare time in writing books for children which, though written with the utmost simplicity of language, are models of good English. . . . He wrote a scathing answer to an attack on his words by the *Saturday*

Review, which was then the great organ of unbelief in England." Yet now the priests and the faithful, face to face with the modern conscience, have done their best not only to forget his books, but to exterminate them like rats.

So also it is with the "Catholic Truth Society" pamphlets; no institution ever followed more faithfully Disraeli's advice to the politician: "Never retract, never explain, never apologise." Fr. Gerard, who had been unconditionally defending the Society's pamphlet on *Monks and Nuns* publicly against me in the *Tablet,* confessed privately to Dr. Gairdner in the British Museum that he agreed with him; it was a great deal too sweeping.[7] The pamphlet has since been smothered and buried, but in the profoundest silence. I am struggling at the present moment to form a collection of "Catholic Truth Society" and similar publications which have been secretly done away with; they will form a very interesting chapter in literary history for succeeding generations.

---

[7] See quotation from Dr. Gairdner's letter on p. 23 of the reprint of my *Catholic Truth and Historical Truth.*

CHAPTER XX.

ROME AND THE SCHOOLS.

On no subject is the Roman controversialist more voluble than on the untrustworthiness of non-Romanist histories. Next to the perfectly natural and legitimate reason that the Roman liturgy and sacraments appeal to some minds with overwhelming force, probably the next which would be given by nine converts out of ten would be this, that their eyes have been opened at last to historical truth. And, among those of them who profess some tincture of historical scholarship, the assertion often takes this concrete form, that the Roman Catholic Lingard was the first, and almost the only, accurate and impartial English historian.

It is a small thing that this omits Hallam, slightly earlier than Lingard, still more learned, and at least equal to him in accuracy and impartiality. Again, it takes no account of the fact that a Catholic who had read more deeply than either, Lord Acton, was actively opposed to the Ultramontane conception of history. It omits, again, the fact that Lingard, on the crucial question of the Dissolution of the Monasteries, agreed rather with the general view of moderate Protestants than with that which Romanists are almost professionally bound to champion. The fullest confession is in a letter to his friend Kirk, defending himself against an unnamed Romanist who blamed him for "not sufficiently entering into defence of the monks." He points out how, so far from emphasising their defects, he has actually kept silence on what he knew, that those of 1536 were almost all "a degenerate, time-serving class of men." As to "the charges against them" by Henry VIII., he has given in his History "the best answers which my poor wit could devise. Perhaps he would have had me deny the whole charge altogether. I did indeed begin by doing so. Some of the proofs against the monks I could get over: but there were many which I could not. The very attempt convinced me that in many instances the charge was founded."[1] Finally, why does not Romanism, if it possesses the truth in history, produce it in a solid form? Why do these converts, who leave us "because they have found the falsity of our history," turn out upon proof to be almost entirely dependent upon the assertions of some mere journalist, dinned weekly into the ears of the public, or upon the censor-ridden writers for such publications as the *Catholic Encyclopædia* or the *Dictionnaire Apologétique?* The Roman Church has almost unlimited funds for propaganda; it has long had the run of other Universities, and now, in addition, it has its own peculiar Universities for its own peculiar truths. Why, all this time, does no real Romanist historian appear who, *covering the whole ground,* can manage to make Ultramontanism probable without omissions or mis-statements which would at once lay him open to correction by other specialists? Why is it that the best of these Papalists are men who do sometimes, indeed, write a masterly book upon a special period or a special subject, yet who steadily avoid dealing in detail with the great questions at issue? For Janssen and Pastor, the learned Germans who have come nearest to this, are full of startling omissions and mis-statements; they have indeed done much to discredit Protestant legends, but their own constructive work will last no longer than those legends did which they have helped to destroy.[2]

The explanation may be given in a proverb current among Norfolk farmers: "You can't get an empty sack to stand upright." Ultramontane history cannot be fully and successfully written, because known facts are against it; the Ultramontane sack is one from which the facts have been carefully eliminated. When Mr. Belloc attempts to rehearse the causes of the Reformation, he is compelled to fall back upon a theory of successive accidents, each of which tells curiously and unfortunately against his own Church; in his philosophy of history, other things may indeed have been governed by Reason or Providence, but the Church has been a plaything of Chance.[3]

---

[1] For the whole passage, of more than a page, see my *Five Centuries of Religion,* Vol. II., p. 458, or the preface to Mr. Chamberlin's *Character of Queen Elizabeth.*

[2] I have given details on this subject in *Five Centuries of Religion,* Vol. I., pp. 408—9, and Vol. II., pp. 407—8 and 505; also *The Mediæval Village,* Appendix 4, and other pages under *Janssen* in index.

The clearest exposure of Romanist weakness in this field has come from their recent attempt to show their strength. The "Westminster Catholic Federation" is a militant society under the special patronage of the Cardinal Archbishop, and, if report be true, with a good deal of American money at its back. This Federation has recently made a determined attempt to force our publishers and the London County Council to make a large number of alterations in the history text books which are most used in our schools. Among other things (it may be noted in passing) they, like the Irish Free State, wish *Catholic* to be substituted everywhere for *Roman Catholic,* whereas the Roman Curia has lately made it one of the most grievous counts against Lord Strickland that, in Malta, he attempted precisely this policy of changing *Roman Catholic* into plain *Catholic,* which Cardinal Bourne's Federation would have us carry out at the expense of much money and trouble and denominational friction![4] This is eminently characteristic of the Federation's whole activities, which may be judged from a recent pamphlet of extracts published by the Church Association[5] and from that appeal to Cardinal Bourne which I have printed, with the Federation's reply, in the first volume of this present work (page xvii. and Appendix IV.). The Church Association pamphlet contains also one victim's account of the manœuvres of the Federation's representatives, who came to the publisher's office with a commission to put on the screw as hard as possible.

---

[3] For details, see the "Review of the Churches," Oct., 1929, which I have reprinted, with additions, in *Mr. Belloc as Historian.* (Simpkin Marshall, Ltd. 6d.)

[4] *Blue Book on Maltese Affairs,* 1930, p. 48; see above, Chapter XIV. of this book.

By a mere accident, however, it has been possible to convict these sectarian intriguers on the evidence of their own memoranda; and it is not altogether beyond the bounds of possibility that one set of these three volumes may some day find its way to the British Museum, for the use of future ecclesiastical historians. And, meanwhile, there is good reason to hope that even this partial publication has done its work (for three newspapers, at least, have published my letter with its quotations). For the London County Council and the publishers cannot fail now to realise why a society with such lofty public aims should so steadily shun the light of ordinary criticism. We may leave Cardinal Bourne's historical experts (who would purge our textbooks of falsehood by deleting the "meaningless or opprobrious" term *Roman*) to fight it out with Cardinal Gasparri (who treats Lord Strickland as a falsifier for this very deletion of *Roman*). The episode is mainly important as emphasising the common-sense conclusion that those who desire their own peculiarities to be taught under the name of history must pay for those peculiarities out of their own purse. Meanwhile, however, Romanist journalists will not, on that account, desist for a moment from the parrot-cry that they alone have the true key to all history. After all, why should they desist? The repetition costs them nothing, and none of their numerous camouflages is more effective with that section of the public to whom they habitually appeal. I was shown, lately, three or four letters from a writer of artistic temperament, who has " gone over," written in answer to a critical correspondent. They were ludicrous, and at the same time pathetic, in their naïve reliance upon journalistic history and upon the *Dictionnaire Apologétique* type of historical argument. The professional apologist, like the fisherman, knows that no bait is better for the next fish than that which has been disgorged by a past victim.

---

[5] *R.C. Scheme for Tampering with School History Readers,* 13 Buckingham Street, Strand.

With regard to the general question of school control, it has never been completely in the hands of the Romanist clergy without ending in revolution and in anti-religion. We have seen confessions of failure from continental Romanists; and in Britain there is evidently something of the same disillusion among earnest and thinking men, though the greater freedom of thought and action in this country has prevented this fundamental contrast between Romanist and non-Romanist from growing to its full natural proportions.

A good deal of frank speech about history and schools has been printed in an occasional magazine called *Order* (Bumpus & Co.), published anonymously by a group which proclaims " We are Catholics, speaking to Catholics." It is critical, and must so far be discounted; but it is far from wholly destructive criticism; there is an evident aim at reconstruction all through. In three, at least, out of the four numbers which have yet appeared, between June, 1928 and November, 1929, the school question has come in. In the June number, it was the subject of a special article, *The Catholic Public Schools and Religious Education.* The writer begins with the highest class, a boy coming up to the University from one of the greater schools, and intelligent enough to " obtain a scholarship, say in history." The writer goes on: " This same person, who on his own subject may be a scholar of some worth, will frequently entertain puerile and absurd ideas about the most elementary dogmas. Church history is for him non-existent; his acquaintance with the New Testament is limited to perhaps two gospels, with a few fragments of the epistles. It is true that he can repeat the Apostles' Creed and has learnt his penny catechism; but he has not been brought to a true appreciation of them, and outside them he is incredibly ignorant. For example, he may very well have no opinion as to the meaning of the Mass or have never met some of the doctrines of the Church which affect most vitally his life as a layman. As regards knowledge of his religion, especially when his opportunities are taken into consideration, he compares unfavourably with an uneducated peasant. . . . But the average person who lays no claim to scholastic achievements is in much the same position. He has probably passed the School Certificate or the London Matriculation—that is, he has in these matters reached a certain standard. What corresponding standard has he reached in his religious knowledge? He knows no more about his religion than he knew as a child of ten; or has added to that foundation odd and confused pieces of structure which merely encumber the ground. The only excuse for such a scholastic system would be that the average pupil is, in religious matters, a congenital imbecile. That premiss I consider unfounded. If, therefore, the defect is not in the person taught, it must lie in the person teaching or in the manner of his teaching. That there is a defect somewhere no one who has been to an English Catholic school himself or who has had relations with its products can in conscience deny. The ignorance on religious topics manifested by such boys or young men is both crass and stupefying. . . . The persons responsible for Catholic education in England maintain, tacitly, a thoroughly bad and impious belief that religion is not at all properly intelligible: it is a matter of practice and experience. Perhaps they have been unconsciously infected by contact with heretics professedly of this opinion. They maintain that if a boy practise his religion faithfully, their business is finished. Clearly he must go to Mass and to the Sacraments—nothing can take the place of the grace there received; and as clearly he must lead a life which is in fact in accordance with his Christian principles. But there is a vast amount more to be done. If he is to be an educated Catholic gentleman he must *know* his religion; and in his knowledge of it he must differ from the uneducated person as a lawyer differs from a law-abiding citizen. It is a mad lawyer who, going frequently to court, prides himself on having never opened a text-book. A Catholic school which does not explicitly instruct in doctrine is as mad."

This was a bold challenge to the authorities, who therefore deputed Fr. Ronald Knox to answer it "before Cardinal Bourne and a large number of clergy and laity at St. Edmund's College, Ware." The choice was politic, since this newly-converted Fr. Knox, in his spiritual autobiography, had published a highly-coloured picture of public school religious education in this Church in which he himself was never a schoolboy. Fr. Knox took as his text the first half-page of the words I have just quoted from *Order,* down to *an uneducated peasant,* "because" (as he said) "a palpable over-statement might arrest attention and make for a clearing of the issues." *Order,* therefore, in its August number quoted a summary of his address and criticised it in turn. They pointed out that, even on Fr. Knox's own showing, "there is little of matter for congratulation." But (they argued) Fr. Knox had simply condemned *Order* off-hand for overstatement, without producing for his condemnation any such evidence as *Order* could produce in defence. They go on to maintain their original criticism, with an appeal to notorious facts; the last paragraph may be quoted as typical. "'*He may very well have . . . never met some of the doctrines of the Church which most vitally affect his life as a layman.*' Well, can any of us say without any reservation that this is impossible after the considerations made above? As a matter of fact, the general trend of Father Knox's remarks would seem to show that he would agree with this last-quoted statement. . . . Finally, let us be clear on this point : a deep knowledge and a faithful practice of his religion in every boy is *not* to be hoped for. But what *is* to be demanded and fought for is that the Catholic Public Schools should *officially* set for themselves a higher ideal in the matter of instruction than that which they display, so that it need not be the case (as it is at present) that a full Catholic education should be gained outside the hours, and beyond the responsibility, of officialdom." In November, 1929, again, *Order* reverts to the subject with two parallel articles on *Apologetics at School,* which show how much is still to be done before boys can be turned out with any real grasp of their own Church doctrines.

Still more important is a recent article in the Jesuit *Month,* which, like the *Catholic Encyclopædia,* is a curious medley of obscurantism with occasional flashes of real frankness. In the issue for November, 1929, the first place is given to Mr. Eric Hanson's article on *Religious Instruction and Leakage,* encouraged by a new scheme which has been worked for six years with success in the Birmingham diocese. In contrast with this, he criticises the traditional system which is still in vogue in most quarters, and which, as he contends, contrasts painfully with the enormous advance which worldly folk have made in general education. He is apparently an inspector of some years' standing, and he claims on his first page to voice the thoughts of many teachers who are silent out of reverence for hierarchical discipline. He continues (p. 385) :—

" First of all, let us recall the mournful subject of the thousands of children lost to the Church every year. It is said that we lose in this way a number almost equal to our gains by adult conversions, so that the net increase in our numbers is small. So far as I can learn the facts, there seems little doubt that Father John Wright's statements some fifteen years ago about the common cessation of attendance at Mass after our children leave school are still substantially correct, except where it has been possible to organise the after-school welfare activities which he suggested." "This monstrous evil would seem to have many roots," "our tepidity in dealing with the drink curse," overcrowding, State neglect of the rights of the poor, "our failure to encourage thrift," etc. The leakage among boys who have been to a secondary school (he contends) is small (p. 388). "If you can hold a boy till he is 15 +, under conditions that add to his mental outfit, enlarge his mind and elevate his interests and ideals, and *pari passu* continue his religious training on truly sane lines, I am convinced that you will vastly reduce the deplorable leakage that occurs at present when the boys leave school. But something more must be done first, in the primary school itself.

"Our traditional methods and scope of religious teaching must have been devised, one is tempted to think, either by grave divines who had long ago forgotten what the mind of a child is like. . . . . . No criticism is commoner in the Reports of Diocesan Inspectors than that which points out failure to understand simple points of doctrine. I attribute that failure to our excessive concentration on memorising things instead of understanding them. . . . Nearly all the 370 answers in the Catechism, however, so laboriously committed to memory, will be forgotten within two or three years after a boy has left school." He proceeds to give details from his own experience (p. 389). "Come to a group of boys of 12 or thereabouts, thirty of them, newly enrolled in a 'first-year' class of a secondary school. They have passed a special entrance examination, and are keen and alert and over the average in intelligence. I find them strong in memory work, but weak in questions off that narrow track. 'First let me hear you recite the Angelus.' (Correctly said and devoutly.) 'What name is given to that great event or mystery?' (Answered readily.) 'On what day in the year does the Church celebrate the Annunciation?' (Only a few knew that.) 'Now express in simple words the meaning of "The Word was made Flesh."' (None present could say that 'The Word' means the Son of God. Several declared that it meant 'the prophetic word,' but saw that that made nonsense of the sentence.) . . .

"'"Through the same Jesus Christ, *Thy Son*, our Lord." Whom, then, are we addressing?' ('It is addressed to Jesus Christ,' they said.) 'Oh no! Whose Son is Jesus Christ?' ('The Son of Mary.')

"'Tell me this, Why do we call the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity "God the Son"?' (All beaten. At last a boy says, 'We call Him God the Son because He became the Son of Mary.') . . . I have been told often that in Holy Mass all the prayers are addressed to Jesus Christ, even the Pater Noster! I could multiply my examples of the consequence of devoting the teacher's time and labour to memorising rather than instruction. Even more impressive is the children's ignorance of matters relating to worship. Holy Mass is tedious to most of them. Lack of knowledge breeds lack of interest. . . .

"Certainly piety and the catechism (well understood) are of the first importance. But are there not other things for which time can be found as well, which will add mightily to the security and religious usefulness of a young man or woman in these difficult times? Why should their religious knowledge be thus limited? I have sometimes found that when pupils were presented for certificates in the Oxford and Cambridge 'Locals' they and their teachers had the *novel experience* of reading one of the Gospels and the Acts, or whatever the book set might be." (Italics his.)

CHAPTER XXI.

JOURNALISM.

Any journalist, like any other preacher, may at any moment be confronted with a serious problem of conscience. But, among all institutions which claim the respect of civilised humanity, there is none which lays so much strain upon the journalist's conscience as the Roman Church. Here and there we get frank confessions, like those articles by Julien de Narfon from which I have already quoted; but, in the nature of the case, the victim is generally silent. Worst of all, he may grow gradually in love with his chains.

The average Roman Catholic journalist, naturally enough, does not rise above the moral level of the hierarchy which encourages or directly employs him, and upon which, in any case, he is to a great extent dependent for his daily bread. In those parts of our Empire where Romanists are in power, the journalist is a helot. The Archbishop of Montreal needed only to breathe upon *Les Débats* (Oct. 4th, 1903) and the journal was extinct in a week or two. The same writers started it under another name; this again was at once denounced from every pulpit in the diocese (Jan. 20th, 1904), and it was dead for ever; not even could a Protestant printer be found to brave the episcopal boycott.[1] The other day, in Malta, more than one paper was compelled by ecclesiastical censure to suppress itself and reappear under another name and in another spirit. An able French writer has pointed out the historical significance of this kind of policy.[2]

---

[1] R. de Marmande, *Le Cléricalisme au Canada,* 1911, Ch. VIII., *La Liberté de la Presse.*

[2] Emile Faguet, de l'Académie Française, *L'Anticléricalisme* (6th thousand), pp. 1, 81ff, 369.

Anticlericalism is "the most widespread malady in the French race; one of the deepest-seated and most acute." The prodigious rapidity with which the educated classes in France lapsed into irreligion or indifference from about 1700 onwards was due to "the prodigious inutility, unreasonableness, want of real pretext, and stupidity, which marked the long persecutions of the sixteenth century"; and this comes out in the remarkable historical fact that "those districts of France which, nowadays, contain the greatest number of wild anticlericals are precisely those which, less than a century ago, contained the greatest number of furious clericals": the modern anticlerical (he notes) "is simply a clerical turned inside out." Stillman notes the same of Italy after 1870 (*National Review,* May, 1899, p. 395). He is speaking of the Papal attempts to influence the elections by clerical prohibitions, official thunder from the pulpit, and threats of major or minor excommunication. But, as he points out, "it is only in portions of Lombardy (where, for the rest, atheism, radicalism and socialism also have their strongest hold in all the kingdom) that a majority of the voting population can be brought to vote for clerical candidates."

Yet, though the Roman hierarchy has steadily encouraged this Veuillot type of writer, the sounder sense of more educated Catholics has often revolted against them. In pre-Emancipation England, Bishop Baines spoke frankly more than once about the editor of the *Orthodox Journal:* "that very violent and abusive man Eusebius Andrews," "a vulgar pugilist."[3] The typical French journalist of this kind, infinitely superior in intellect but scarcely in Christianity, was Louis Veuillot, of the *Univers.* Concerning him and his fellows, Lacordaire is reported to have said:[4] "The Church had then, for her defenders, a set of clumsy

[3] B. Ward, *Eve of Cath. Emancipation,* Vol. III., pp. 337ff.

[4] Chaine, p. 85. Cf. Lugas in *Dublin Review* (April, 1928).

fellows; men who exaggerate faults in their own belief that they are strengthening, and who, with the best intentions in the world to save everything, would ruin God Himself, if God could be ruined." Veuillot was one of the main secondary forces which secured the Decree of 1870; but at a cost which the French Church has not yet fully paid, after all her sufferings. It was in vain that many of the more sensible parish priests revolted against this theological dictatorship of a layman in episcopal employ. One of them published a protest in which he exposed this journalism out of its own mouth, *L'Univers jugé par lui-même* (Paris, Dentu, 1856). He wrote (p. 198): "Catholics understand (and henceforth they will always understand better), how much it concerns the interest and the honour and the respect of the holy cause which they defend, to choose their allies only with prudent discernment, and, especially, never to accept, nor to allow others to impose upon them, as representatives or leaders, in this great and difficult fight against error and evil, men whose lack of sense and sound learning, whose absence of fixed principles, whose systematic antipathy to all Christian moderation and wisdom, whose coarse and violent passions, can only lead Catholics astray, divide them, compromise them and (what would be fatal in a country like ours) degrade them in the eyes of their adversaries, by robbing them of that most precious of possessions, their reputation for uprightness and honour." And again (p. 200): "The Church knows that the greatest disorders in the Christian society have almost always come from the displacement of authority, whoever may be the usurpers; whether they be kings or journalists, it is all one. We are not even afraid to assert that the intrusion of journalists, as directing powers and as inner mainspring of the Church, would be even more fatal than that of the secular authorities." Yet the French Church has not yet fully learned the lesson; *La Croix* of to-day is one of the most vulgar and uncivilised papers in the country. And there, as in other countries, as though there were not a busy enough trade at home, a more violent partisan spirit is imported from abroad.

During the early years of this century, Catholics were terrorised by a Papal journal entitled *Corrispondenza Romana,* at the back of which was an unscrupulous adventurer called Benigni. By this person (writes Pernot, p. 259), " every common trick was employed with admirable composure : he did not stick even at blackmail, contradictions, and falsification of dates. He published at Rome a telegram forged in his own office under the form of an interview obtained at Paris by the correspondent of an Italian paper; an interview which professed to enlighten public opinion upon the attitude of the French Episcopate in face of the Law of Separation. . . . This telegraphic agency constitutes, in fact, a vast enterprise of international libel, directed not only against the French Church and its bishops, but also against the French nation." Pernot quotes one example of Benigni's methods. He libellously attacked a French professor's proposed course of lectures at the *Ecole des Hautes Etudes;* it was " scandalous " that a Catholic should teach at this " Jewish-Masonic institution "—i.e. at a Government college which is rather more distinguished than our own London School of Economics. Thus goaded on, the Catholic authorities intervened and forbade the professor's lectures, and several papers put two and two together. To this the *Corrispondenza* answered : " Our amazed readers will exclaim [to us] : ' Why ! you have never whispered a word of this matter [in your paper], either before or after ! ' " Not (be it noted) " *we assert* that we have never said a word of " a matter which in fact they had printed only seven weeks earlier, but " *our amazed readers will say,*" and so on. The whole of this fifteenth chapter in Pernot's book should be read to realise the full discreditable nature of this Roman organ, and the disgust which it aroused among decent men of all creeds in France.

Things have never come quite to this pass in Britain, where a Romanist group of 5½ per cent lives under the free traditions of centuries, and in healthy fear of attracting too unfavourable attention from the other 94½ per cent. Yet, even here, thoughtful men among the orthodox deplore the spirit of their own "religious" journals. The already-quoted *Order* voices these misgivings. (Vol. I., pp. 22, 52, 96, 113.) It points out the Pharisaism of these papers: e.g. (p. 52).

> " (From a letter to *The Universe* prominently displayed in that paper.)
>
> 'I take this occasion to express my admiration for your splendid publication, which is always forceful, while restrained and dignified. It is an honour to the Church throughout the world.'
>
> *(Signed)* M. V. RIORDAN,
> Arizona Lumber and Timber Camp,
> Flagstaff, Arizona."

Again (p. 96) the writer quotes with approval the remark of an Anglican friend. "Well, tell your editors and orators about [what I have been saying to you]. If they feel they must go on attacking the religion that is dear to most English people I suppose they must. But in that case tell them they needn't waste any time asking English people to pay for their schools, where such a spirit will be taught and spread. We may be foolish and illogical, but we aren't such fools as that. I wish you'd tell 'em so." Finally (p. 113): "The English Catholic Press is both an example and a warning, since it somehow manages to be entirely out of touch with the real world—to live in the atmosphere of the sacristy—and yet at the same time to be thoroughly unsupernatural and even materialistic."

Moreover, these writers in *Order,* like the French priest in his criticism of *L'Univers,* are perfectly alive to the dangers of putting such journalism in the forefront of their battle. They know perfectly well that some of these skirmishers are not only raw and half-disciplined, but sometimes half-armed; their secret prayer is *Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis!* Father Hugh Benson made a splash at first; he was a nine days' wonder at Cambridge; but presently he was found to be cutting no more ice, and was therefore promoted. He was, what Fr. Ronald Knox is after him, first and foremost a journalist, writing necessarily, if only subconsciously, to order, and therefore unable to make a deep impression even upon those who are fascinated by wit. There is deep psychological significance in the stress which Fr. Knox lays upon his own college and his degree.[5] He quotes complacently "what the late Prime Minister called 'the effortless superiority of Balliol men.'" And, again, "A first in Greats left me neither a professional philosopher nor a professional historian; but it left me with a fierce love of sifting evidence and the power of not being fascinated into acquiescence when superior persons talked philosophy at me." Here, surely, it specially behoves the man who thinketh he standeth to take heed lest he fall. Descartes pointed out long ago —and it is implicit in all the teaching of Socrates— that, widely as men differ in brain-power and in learning, the thing that really matters is will-power, the determination to get at the truth. The "Balliol men" and the "Firsts in Greats" were just the sort of men with whom Socrates waged lifelong war. They, again, were the men who saw nothing in early Christianity but a silly superstition. Again, it was the "Balliol men" of the Middle Ages who, now that Christianity

[5] *Spiritual Aeneid,* pp. 53, 63.

had risen to immense political power, made it as much as a man's life was worth to answer the deepest questions of philosophy or religion in any but the stereotyped fashion. In a dozen Cabinets, Firsts in Greats have failed to see what the Man in the Street saw plainly enough: to Gladstone (perhaps the most conspicuous example of this class), posterity is now inclined to apply the title which Lord Acton applied to Newman: "that splendid sophist." The worst intellectual vice, wrote Bossuet, is not to have taken a poor degree, but "to believe that things are, because we should like them to be": to go to sleep, as Fr. Knox confesses that he did, over the discussion between Bishop Gore and Dom Chapman as to the main differences between that faith in which Fr. Knox was educated, and that other faith which, in sad ignorance of much of the most important historical evidence, he has now adopted. And there are many in his new Church who see this as plainly as any Anglican sees it. They do not take him seriously because they know that a breath may make him, as a breath has made. He himself has described his final transition in terms of modern convenience; his last step, he tells us, was as easy as to step off a moving staircase. In some ways the comparison is perfect in psychological aptitude; but in one sense it is not happy: our successful transference from the moving stairs depends upon our not putting the right foot first.

Mr. Chesterton and Mr. Belloc, again, who for a short time shared something like Veuillot's influence, are gradually losing ground among the more thoughtful of their own Church. Mr. Belloc, among his other purely literary gifts, has one of the rarest of all; he can repeat the same thing a hundred times over, sometimes even within a few lines, yet seldom weary the reader. But a whole group of the younger Roman Catholics is beginning to realise that a doubtful statement remains doubtful, even when it has been shouted a hundred times in the most stentorian tones. More important still, they begin now to realise his appalling indifference to easily-verifiable facts: for there are many young Roman Catholics now at our Universities, and they cannot help catching the general spirit, under which a lecturer must be ready to give his vouchers, or must gradually lose the confidence of his class. If Mr. Belloc steadily refuses now to defend, in the open, those challenges which he proclaims directly or indirectly from his own journalistic pulpits, that is because he himself, in his secret conscience, knows how unready he is to support strict cross-examination. I say this with all sense of responsibility, of which I have already given proof by putting it more than once into print.[6] One point may be added to these, as specially significant. In Mr. Belloc's attempt to prove that 57,374 souls had died at Norwich in the Black Death, he more than once implied that the real cause of our difference lay in my never having seen the original records. These, in fact, I had never pretended to have consulted, basing myself explicitly on the work of one of our most careful antiquaries who was familiar with them, the Rev. W. Hudson, F.S.A. It soon became evident from Mr. Belloc's own arguments that he himself had never seen them; and a mere chance, some months later, put this beyond all doubt. A pupil of mine happened to go to Norwich to study the Black Death records for his own purpose; he reported to me that they had not been consulted by anybody for many years. I then wrote to the official custodian, who obligingly went through the records—complete since 1896—and reported that Mr. Belloc's name was not among those who had ever searched the original documents. This goes some way to explain the otherwise almost unaccountable mis-statements which will be found exposed by my letter in that Appendix. Among other things, he had asserted that the city of Norwich was divided into only 12 " tithings "; it contained, in fact, nearly 160. Yet he has never, from that day to this, even confessed this fundamental mis-statement, let alone apologised for it!

---

[6] Especially in the nineteenth of my *Mediæval Studies* (Simpkin Marshall, Ltd., 6d.), from which it is reprinted in Appendix III. to Vol. I. of this work. Cf. a similar correspondence between Prof. A. F. Pollard and Mr. Belloc in *The Observer* for Dec. 16th, 1930 onwards.

Nor is this merely exceptional; it is characteristic. In *The Review of the Churches* (Jan., 1926, p. 142) he based an accusation of ignorance against me on (1) an inaccurate reference to his own past writings, which I was able to expose by printing the actual words he had used, and (2) two equally untrue bibliographical assertions about Matthew Paris, which it needed only a few minutes' reference to the two editions in question to contradict. Since the Editor limited the correspondence to one letter each from us, I offered in mine to print and publish, at my own expense, anything he might have to say in excuse for these crucial mis-statements. He was silent here; but in *The New Statesman,* a week or two afterwards, he published an article describing " a controversy in a learned Review," in which he himself had found himself engaged against a Charlatan, and had "easily got the better of the Don." A pupil drew my attention to this, pointing out that Mr. Belloc gave details which, however inaccurate in themselves, could only refer to this *Review of the Churches* discussion as seen through his own spectacles. I therefore wrote to *The New Statesman* repeating my offer to print all that Mr. Belloc had to say, and pointing out that a fresh point he now tried to make about Ebion and Origen and Gibbon " depends on his own crass ignorance of what Gibbon knew perfectly well, that not only we do not possess Origen's commentary on *Romans,* but we have not even a real translation of it." The Editor declined to print my letter, on the plea that the article itself had contained "no specific reference." But, when *The Methodist Recorder* independently raised the subject of Matthew Paris, Mr. Belloc wrote (March 11th, 1926) : " I must warn your Reviewer that Dr. Coulton had the temerity to repeat this libel; and, if your Reviewer will turn to the current number of *The Review of the Churches,* he will see what happened to him as the consequence of his rashness." I replied by printing in *The Methodist Recorder* that answer which *The New Statesman* had suppressed, and repeating my offer to print at my own expense any excuse that might be possible for Mr. Belloc's mis-statements of fact. Mr. Belloc replied "Dr. Coulton, beaten on the point of Matthew Paris, drags in a new and totally different matter, my discovery of Ebion in Origen." In half a column, he ignored here again my proof that he had written in complete ignorance of the crucial fact: and the Editor remarked "readers will observe that Mr. Belloc does not take up the challenge repeated by Dr. Coulton in our issue of last week." He gave no further sign of life in *The Methodist Recorder.*

In *The Nation and Athenæum* for May 7th, 1927, Mr. Belloc accused me of ignorance of the distinction in Roman theology between *divorce* and *annulment* of marriage. This, he pointed out, was typical of "people as ignorant as Dr. Coulton is of Catholic philosophy and mediæval thought." He arrived at this accusation by the simple process of omitting the qualification I had carefully put in; "divorce . . . *in the sense in which the ordinary reader would understand these words.*" I pointed out this crucial omission, and the fact that nineteen years before, in my *Chaucer and his England,* I had publicly explained the distinction between *divorce* and *annulment.* Here, again, neither defence nor apology. But a little later, in a footnote to one of his articles in *The Universe,* the falsehood was repeated without qualification.[7]

---

[7] An interesting by-product of this correspondence was a series of well-meaning letters by Mr. F. J. Gorman, who, while undertaking to correct an ex-Romanist correspondent, Mr. J. W. Poynter, fell himself into a heresy explicitly condemned by the Council of Trent and exposed in so natural a work of reference as *The Catholic Encyclopædia* (June 11th).

The *Church Times* for June 1st, 1928, reviewing in one and the same article a volume of mine and another by Mr. Belloc, condemned me off-hand because my statements about the numbers at Oxford disagreed with his. "Now let us see how Dr. Coulton writes. . . . Compare the statements of the two writers. Apparently, Mr. Coulton knows nothing of the Oxford University statistics. If he had known, he would certainly have attempted to refute them. Apparently he is completely ignorant—" of certain other facts quoted by Mr. Belloc, but utterly inconclusive in themselves. To this I replied by pointing out that my view of the Oxford numbers was that of nearly all history teachers of to-day, who, if they noticed at all that statement on which Mr. Belloc relied, did so "as a warning to their pupils not to accept mediæval figures without careful examination. . . . I defy your reviewer to produce any historian with a reputation to lose who will publicly profess a belief in [Mr. Belloc's] 30,000 [students]." I quoted specifically from Rashdall's great *Universities of Europe,* and the reviewer, ignoring all the rest of my letter, accused me of "rejecting [the statistics] on the authority of a distinguished modern writer," adding "Some of us are sceptical of the scepticism of the Victorian age." The Editor, by printing this challenge for statistics, and by this sneer at Victorian sceptics, obviously transferred the question to the ground of actual contemporary documents. I was here reinforced by the voluntary intervention of Mr. H. E. Salter, whose years of labour upon the Oxford muniments have now earned him a seat in the British Academy, and who, arguing independently from two different angles among contemporary documents, concluded that these both pointed to about 1,500 students; that is, only half as many as Rashdall grants, and one-twentieth of Mr. Belloc's computation! Mr. Belloc, answering in nearly a column of the paper, relied entirely upon the familiar and incredible figure given by FitzRalph (Chancellor in 1333), and concluding:

"Mr. Rashdall gives 3,000—one tenth. Which is the better witness—such a contemporary as FitzRalph, or a don writing 600 years later, and on guess-work at that?" Not a hint of the documents quoted by Mr. Salter, or of his deductions from them! I answered, adducing contemporary evidence to show that mediæval writers whom we had every reason to trust more fully than FitzRalph had, nevertheless, demonstrably made the most incredible mis-statements when they came to large numbers. And I emphasised Mr. Belloc's obvious unfamiliarity with FitzRalph's actual text in a paragraph from which the Editor took the liberty of expunging my words "it is only charitable to suppose that he has never read the booklet from which he professedly quotes." I was, in fact, prepared to prove that he had taken his evidence at second-hand from Gasquet's *Great Pestilence,* which he reproduced so slavishly as to copy exactly a very peculiar and distinctive blunder which the Cardinal had made in his summary, and for which there is no shadow of justification in the original. Mr. Belloc replied by simply repeating his former assertions, and adding a few more lines of personal abuse, and ending with "I await some real argument." The Editor chose that moment for the guillotine. I wrote to him by post: "Am I really to understand that, after printing from Mr. Belloc 'I await some real argument,' you refuse to allow me to draw his attention to the actual words of FitzRalph (the one matter really at dispute between us), and to leave your readers to judge how far this original document really supports a statement [as to the 30,000 scholars] which so careful and judicial a scholar as Mr. Salter condemns as 'impossible'? Surely some real proportion of your readers has some sort of interest in historical truth; and we are not likely to weary them by proving (on one side or another) how far mediæval numbers are to be taken at their face value." The reply ran: "I regret that it is quite impossible for me to give any more space to your controversy with Mr. Belloc." To bring out the full significance of this, let us remember, first, that the point is of very great importance for all mediæval, and, therefore, Church history, and, secondly, that in this discussion I was attempting, with the concurrence of the two greatest authorities on this particular subject, to defend myself against the original argument of the *Church Times* that a University teacher of history, simply because he takes a view divergent from Mr. Belloc's, "apparently knows nothing . . . . if he had known, he would certainly have attempted . . . apparently he is completely ignorant." It is not even as though this lick-spittle policy were in the least degree successful in securing any real *rapprochement* with Rome. The Romans despise it; they take adulation at its true value; and here is a significant quotation from the *Catholic Herald's* notice of this particular dispute (June 30th). The Editor notes that Mr. Coulton "has provoked High Anglicans by defending Professor Maitland—be it always remembered that Maitland makes the 'High Party' cross because he showed clearly that the Mediæval Church in England was not anti-Papal. A dig at the Pope would be ever dear to 'Anglos'!" Few things contribute more directly to the real scorn—real in the sense of natural and unaffected, however unjust—which the Continental Romanist feels for Anglo-Catholics, than their attempts to curry favour by helping to tip up unfairly the Romanist scale in the controversy with Protestantism. Do those whom the Romanists nickname "Anglos" never read the Romanist papers? It is a thousand pities that the *Church Times,* which for a generation has been one of the ablest of our papers, should follow a policy which has no more real claim to Christian charity and justice than the facing and stating of plain facts would have; and which, even from a worldly point of view, is certain sooner or later to fail as it deserves.

Meanwhile, I drew Mr. Belloc's and the Editor's attention, by ordinary post, to the following facts. (1.) FitzRalph's pamphlet is, from end to end, a bitter attack upon the Friars, and he catches at every stick to beat them. (2.) For instance, he asserts that in his own single diocese of Armagh he had, every year, 2,000 homicides, thieves and similar felons, to whom the Friars furtively gave absolution; are we, then, to take these figures also on his bare word, and to suppose that Ireland in the mid fourteenth century produced about 62,000 felons per annum; that is, about one in every thirty of the adult population? (3.) His assertion of Oxford numbers is made under exactly the same temptation; he is insisting that the Friars have ruined the University, no careful man will now send his son there, and the numbers (he says) have therefore fallen from 30,000 to 6,000. (4.) Mr. Belloc's words about "a third of" 30,000 are not in FitzRalph's text nor can they in any way be inferred from it; they are a pure blunder of Gasquet's, blindly transcribed by Mr. Belloc. (5.) So, again, is the assertion that this alleged falling off in numbers had anything whatever to do with the Black Death; FitzRalph says the contrary, yet these two modern Romanists base upon it one of their most exaggerated Black Death theories, designed to falsify Reformation history! (6.) Finally, I concluded: "You write: 'FitzRalph's figures are confirmed within a lifetime by another, who tells us he had seen them on the old rolls.' Will you kindly tell me where you find evidence for this assertion?"[8] Neither Mr. Belloc, nor the Editor who in a sense stood sponsor for him, answered. It was evident that neither had any direct knowledge of the text on the strength of which they condemned such specialists as Rashdall and Mr. Salter; yet that they had not the frankness to let the public see the true facts of the case.

[8] Let me add that I know very well what Mr. Belloc was here thinking of, and what misconception was bred in his mind from this assertion which he had borrowed without verification; I only wanted to elicit this from his own mouth.

The other great journalist of the party, Mr. Chesterton, is less unscrupulous; yet he also is sometimes demoralised by the habit of defending, professionally, things that are in themselves indefensible. With him I can deal rather more briefly than with his mentor. During the discussion which followed, in the Cambridge Guildhall, upon his lecture on *The Superstitions of the Sceptic,* I drew his attention to the fact that what he called Puritanism was really a mediæval product, surviving into the Reformation period. The discussion focussed itself on the attitude of the Mediæval Church towards dancing, both on holy-days and at any other time. Mr. Chesterton caused general amusement by taking it for granted that a questioner in a University town was his own inferior on the ground of mediæval history; he preened himself visibly under the ripple of laughter, and the event of the evening was his lightning-change of manner when he suddenly realised that the undergraduates' merriment was against himself. A correspondence ensued, continued by him in *The Dublin Review* (where he was safe), and by me in *The Review of the Churches* (where he was offered the right of reply, but did not accept it).[9] It had by that time become sufficiently plain that the real difficulty lay in Mr. Chesterton's unfamiliarity with the ordinary Latin of mediæval theologians, from St. Thomas Aquinas onwards, and in his inability to realise even his own ignorance. Since then I have had more than one opportunity of testing his knowledge on these points on which he writes, if not with all Mr. Belloc's stupendous self-assertion, at least with an apparent confidence which deceives many readers.[10] Moreover, he is almost as impenitent as Mr. Belloc when once he has his back to the wall; in the *Daily Telegraph* for Jan. 9th, 1929, he actually maintained in cold blood, finding no other resource, that, for logical purposes, *childlike* and *childish* are convertible terms! Here again, however, even Romanist readers are beginning to look at their champion from a steadier angle. Here is a significant quotation from *Order* (p. 6): "Unfortunately, it is necessary to point out that the fact [that good religious journalism must never forget ordinary daily wants and daily life] does not express the morbid hankering of a 'G.K's Weakling' for *symbolic* beer. We have also just read this (G.K's *Weekly*, Feb. 11th): 'And we ask you (journalists) Do you at last understand that the last shred of liberty is going? do you understand that men —*men such as drank in the old taverns*—cannot exist in the world?' Our italics, but that is Chestertonism, a base by-product of the distilled wisdom of Chesterton . . . but we digress." That is a minor weakness of the Chestertonian journalism; but its major weakness lies in the author's habit of tilting at his own Turk's Heads. Whatever half-dozen pages we may take for analysis, we find much the same thing; Mr. Chesterton cannot expose his opponent's folly until he has first re-stated it in foolish words for himself. Then he is happy: his animal spirits flow freely; he writes with an ease which carries his reader along. Yet, even so, his younger disciples begin to long for a change of tune; and a group is gradually forming which pauses over his pages to ask how far they will bear quiet analysis—nay, even more, a group which, while thoroughly sympathising with his beliefs, is in sympathy also with those who no longer trouble to read him. As I happen to know, it has excited no great surprise that neither he nor Mr. Belloc ventures publicly to discuss such subjects as Papal Infallibility, or the causes of the Reformation, under cross-examination; their own supporters will sometimes say frankly: "They know quite well that they are not up to that particular job." Mr. Chesterton's own correspondence practically tells the same tale. He alone, of the seven Roman controversialists whom I approached, did at first show an inclination to face the test. But, after blowing hot and cold for more than four months, he finally compelled me to write (Oct. 29th): "I propose to print . . . enclosed summary of our correspondence. If you feel it inaccurate or unfair, I will of course pay great attention to any protest on your part, if only because I promise my readers to correct any error of fact which may be pointed out to me." That summary ran: "After a month's delay, for which Mr. Chesterton was not responsible, he answered me (July 5th): 'I should be quite ready for a debate as you suggest, if we could agree on a subject, logical conditions, and a chairman.' I answered at once, proposing, 'That the doctrine of Papal Infallibility is historically indefensible' (or, if he preferred to open the debate, 'historically defensible'). I proposed for chairman a well known Jesuit Father, and suggested definite rules for the debate. Since that, I have written him five more letters, received two notes of acknowledgment from his secretary, and from himself two letters which seemed to me simply evasive. I had accepted without hesitation the emendations he suggested for my programme, and only pressed him to let me know whether he agreed upon subject, conditions and chairman, and whether he would promise, when his present heavy engagements were fulfilled (early in 1930 was the time he suggested) to meet me in this discussion. My third letter (Aug. 20th) pointed out that I did not want to go off for my holiday without knowing whether or not I was engaged for early next year. My fourth (Aug. 27th) suggested still more urgently that it was important for us both to know our commitments. To this I received no reply. On Sept. 28th I pointed out that this persistent silence called for an ultimatum. 'If you are away, I have marked on the envelope that this letter is to be opened, and your secretary will let me know that I must reasonably wait. But if, after waiting a reasonable time after receipt of such a letter, I still hear nothing from you, I shall be compelled to conclude that you have no serious intention of accepting my challenge, and to add your name to my list of refusals.' I received an acknowledgment on Oct. 2nd from his secretary, assuring me that he should receive my letter as soon as possible. I waited till Oct. 29th; and then, having received no answer, I wrote informing Mr. Chesterton that I had put him down with his six fellow-controversialists as having declined my challenge." Mr. Chesterton has tacitly allowed this to pass as correct. Readers must pardon what is monotonous and wearisome in this story; nothing but a detailed and dated rehearsal could give any idea of Mr. Chesterton's tergiversations in the matter. Yet this is not in his real nature; it is only an unhappy necessity of his position. There is, in Romanist journalism, an Apostolic Succession of untrustworthiness. Suppression, if not false suggestion, is implicit in their very premises; and, in the last resort, when the journalist finds himself up against an unforeseen yet fatal difficulty, confession being unthinkable, there remains no alternative but evasion.

---

[9] The beginning of this discussion is printed with his speech, *The Superstitions of the Sceptic* (Cambridge, Heffer, 1/6).

[10] One of these points is the mediæval doctrine that the Blessed in heaven rejoice (though, of course, only *per accidens*) in the torments of the Damned. I have printed St. Thomas' words, with reference to Mr. Chesterton, in a leaflet which is at the disposal of anyone who sends a stamped envelope.

Yet here again, the *Church Times,* often critical even with regard to his Anglo-Catholic brethren, is as slavishly deferential to Mr. Chesterton as to Mr. Belloc. The answer of Frs. Milner-White and Knox to Fr. Vernon is reviewed coldly and unsympathetically compared with the welcome given to inferior books from the Roman camp. The notice of Mr. Chesterton's latest book is headed "G.K.C. dead on the wicket"; it evokes for the Editor a picture of Merrie England on the Village Green; and this notice ends, after a column and two-thirds, with "Certainly, well bowled, Sir, well bowled!" There is not a word of warning against those playful rustic liberties which, if it were a first-class pitch instead of a village green, would compel the umpire to no-ball Mr. Chesterton twice or thrice in every over. Yet even in the Roman camp, let it again be repeated, the most intelligent of the young men are beginning to feel and say that their journalists had better school themselves to first-class cricket. It is even conceivable that the first manifestos of this revolt will come rather from the Roman than from the Anglo-Catholic side; and then the last persons to awaken from this dream will be our own country parsons, dependent upon their weekly paper.

Finally, it is worth while to add one word on the fabrications which are circulated casually and indirectly, quite apart from this steady weekly tide of professional journalistic distortions, just as forged bank notes are often uttered through some unsuspecting small tradesman. It is the regular practice of the hierarchy to work behind stalking-horses; if these have social or other extraneous notoriety, so much the better. Writers of that kind are useful to the Cause in proportion to their fundamental ignorance; for they can assert, with the downright conviction of simple good faith, things to which a more experienced Romanist could scarcely commit himself without choosing his words very carefully, and thus losing something of that artless straightforward style which is so potent a factor in persuasion. Thus the late R. H. Benson, who was quite ignorant of the subject, crept into the *Cambridge History of English Literature* with a chapter on the literary results of the Dissolution of the Monasteries. He had enough knowledge to point out that the first troubled years of the Reformation diminished the number of University degrees by 50 per cent; but not enough to realise that, under Elizabeth, they not only made up this deficit at once, but rose, within twenty years, to more than two-and-a-half times as many as they had ever been in Papal England. With regard to the schools, again, he repeated one of the most ludicrous errors that have ever crept into history—the process of overstatement, from generation to generation, through which the bare mention of Abbot Whiting's execution by a contemporary has grown into the story that he had educated "three hundred boys . . . supporting, besides, students at the University."[11] The whole chapter is full of mis-statements or false implications, all tending to sectarian propaganda, fired off upon an unsuspecting public not so much by poor R. H. Benson, who was rather the tool, as by those who had briefed him for the job. Similarly, within the last few weeks, an attempt has been made in *The Contemporary Review* to reassure the British public on the question of Rome's interference with our schools and our political life. This is not written by Cardinal Bourne or by anybody whom he has openly chosen to state the Romanist case, frequently as he has been challenged in public on this count. It is by a layman, Mr. Algernon Cecil, who wrote to me *on this very subject* four-and-a-half-years ago, prefacing his first letter with "I am no student of the Middle Ages," and adding, apologetically, in another letter, "I was, of course, quite off familiar ground." The truth of those humble confessions transpired plainly enough from what he asserted or argued in our correspondence; and it is equally evident that, in this interval, he has not only learnt next to nothing but forgotten some things of primary importance. Why, then, does this descendant of a Protestant ring-leader undertake to instruct the world on his own "Catholic View of Toleration," while his hierarchy and his theologians remain in the background? Therein lies precisely his value to them; he is neither historian nor theologian; but his descent, from men ennobled and enriched by the Reformation, renders him an admirable cover for the professional snipers behind him. Misstatements from this layman go home far more effectually than from an open battery. Moreover, wherever he has blundered too patently, the hierarchy can so much more easily disavow him, and the candid public will be so much readier to pardon the slips of a gentleman who condescends, like Congreve, to do a little polite literature in his leisure hours. I have exposed his mis-statements a little more fully in *The British Weekly* (July 10th and 17th, 1930).

---

[11] I exposed this almost incredible transformation in a paper read before the International Historical Congress of 1913, and since reprinted under the title of *Monastic Schools in the Middle Ages.* (Simpkin Marshall, Ltd.)

It will be seen that these last few chapters are unusually personal, and contain serious charges of literary inaccuracy against some people who have had tens of thousands of readers. But this is inherent in the necessities of my case; and, what is more, I hope it may be final. Small skirmishes are a weariness, and often a waste of time; it is better to drive as straight and as deep as possible to the heart of the problem: " Are Roman apologists to be trusted on this particular question as we ordinarily trust our fellows, and as we should trust these same persons on any other question? " Many friends have told me that time is wasted in dealing with these men; my own feeling is that time has not often been wasted hitherto, but that it would probably be a waste now to pursue the subject further. Men who cheerfully allow mis-statements of the kind which I have exposed to remain under their name, without any form of apology, and who are unwilling to face cross-examination on the main points of difference between their own Church and others, may be shown up thoroughly once for all and then, it is to be hoped, left alone. At least, there will be many readers who will see now that, if others who have serious work to do leave these writers to their own devices in the future, it is because they have already spent upon inaccurate and unrepentant advocates a great deal of time which might have been better employed if no such advocates had ever existed, and if the Roman Church would rely more upon solid learning and argument than upon irresponsible journalism.

One final word about my evidence. When Fr.

Thurston accused me of misrepresenting my first discussion with him, and said that I could safely refer to back numbers of a periodical which few readers could get at, I replied by reprinting these letters *verbatim* for the public to judge between us (*Roman Catholic Church and Bible*, 3rd ed., p. 47). When, again, Messrs. Chesterton and Belloc accused me of misrepresenting a passage in St. Thomas Aquinas which no ordinary reader could verify, then I spent some £10 in reprinting the whole of the section from the Dominican Fathers' translation; this is still at the service of any reader who cares to send me a stamped envelope. And now, if any one of these writers whom I have exposed makes the same innuendo, I will do him the same justice. He has only to assert, and pledge his reputation for accuracy upon it, that the whole correspondence, if published, would tell rather in his favour than mine, and I will then take him at his word and print every word of it for the sake of the few readers who may care to wade through what Huxley once called "cold controversy." Thus, a thing which, if undertaken off-hand now, would be foolish waste of money and time, may gain some real importance. It is only by imitating Romanist persistence, and Romanist willingness to spend wherever there seems some chance of gain for the Cause, that we can bring the reading public to a point where exact comparison is possible between the assertions on either side, bewildering to the ordinary man in their present flat contradictions. If there is a *gens lucifuga* on either the Romanist or the non-Romanist side, let it by all means be dragged into the light. In going to press, I have to add that there is now another volume to come. I was invited to Liverpool to give three lectures last October; these, with the most significant controversy to which they gave rise, will be published shortly under the title of *In Defence of the Reformation* (Simpkin Marshall, Ltd., 3/6 net).

CHAPTER XXII.

EPILOGUE.

I AM frequently told, reproachfully by Roman Catholics whom I do not know personally, and in a friendly way by those with whom I come into personal contact, "You do not know the mind of the ordinary believer."

This would impress me more, but for two considerations. The first is, that I cannot remember ever to have talked things over with any one of them, face to face, without sympathy on both sides, and, therefore, some real approach, however small, to agreement on essentials before we parted. The second is, that I was a boarder at a French Lycée, under far more definitely ecclesiastical conditions than those which prevail at present, for a year and a half under the Second Empire, before either Mr. Chesterton or Mr. Belloc was born—to name only the two who have most definitely attempted to put my words aside as those of an uncomprehending fanatic.

My real difficulty is, to make quiet unaggressive Roman Catholics understand that I write not against them, but against what may be called the officers of their army; nor, again, even against these, except in so far as they themselves are aggressive, or in proportion as they take part with the aggressors actively or by passive sufferance. I am not concerned with what Governor Smith believes as a private person, but only with what, at any moment which might seem politically opportune to his hierarchy, he might be bidden to believe, and treated as a heathen if he refused to believe it; even as Döllinger was excommunicated for persisting to believe, after 1870, what he had been teaching, as the most honoured Catholic historian in Germany, to a whole generation of pupils. Like most people in Britain—and, if they would confess it, like most Roman Catholics in America—I have every sympathy with the Maltese voter at this present moment, but none whatever with the Bishop who refuses him Easter absolution for voting according to his conscience.

Mr. Chesterton, and more than one other convert, have used identical similes: they have "fallen in love with" their Church; and here is one of the most compelling things in human life, yet one of the least explicable to those who do not feel it. In defence of any single conversion, this plea is unanswerable; it narrows down all general principles to a question of personal taste. But why should a man try to force that personal taste upon others in religion, when he would not dream of doing the same in any other matter? Would not anybody be intolerable who should continually argue with us because we do not see his wife with his own eyes? Have we not even invented a proverb to fit a small class of unreasonable old ladies: "Love me, love my dog"? The world, as a rule, has every sympathy with any love-match; but it is absurd that we should be accused of stony or perverse misunderstanding when we go no further than sympathy. We cannot account for every love-match; we can only say that, whether we ourselves see it or not, there must have been enough reality in the woman to attract the man, or in the man, to attract the woman. That much is evident, and, beyond that, no outsider need be called upon to explain. Therefore, the creed which attracts earnest and reasonable men must evidently have something true and reasonable in it. When we have taken every possible account of extraneous reasons, there still remain very many conversions which cannot lightly be explained away. Romanism represents, in part, a very noble and ancient tradition; and many are so hypnotised by that part that they close their eyes, consciously or semi-consciously, or unconsciously, to all that is neither noble in it, nor truly ancient. For the quiet, unaggressive individual, there may be something positively meritorious in thus refusing to look beyond the things that are obviously good, into things which are at any rate superficially dubious, and which might prove nauseous under close inspection. But such men are far removed (however little they may recognise this in their own minds) from those against whom my book is directed; from the men of whom it may truly be said that they are constantly forcing upon us the Roman constituents in their creed and discipline, as apart from the Catholic.

For it has come to a point at which silence can no longer plead Christian charity and morality in its favour. Unbelievers, it is true, are sometimes moved to sneer "See how these Christians love each other!" but, quite apart from the example of our Lord and the Apostles, we have no real excuse for continued silence in face of a propaganda which, we are convinced, is false. Gregory the Great wrote a word which was caught up by St. Bernard and echoed down the whole Middle Ages: "It is better that scandal should be caused, than that truth should be abandoned." And the saintly Fénelon justified his plain speech on the common sense plea: If you object to these hard words, then refrain from the things which such words alone can rightly describe.

If this book cries loudly, it is to meet a crying evil. There is no corporation in the world, as powerful and as respected as the Roman Church, which, in its official capacity, is equally neglectful of what ordinary people call ordinary truth. The fact that, even among the most prominent officers in that great army, there are some whose word on points of religious dispute may be trusted as we may trust their signature to a cheque, goes but a little way to temper what I have just said; for, in practice, such men are swamped in the multitude. If they are learned, they write upon some subject not too intimately bound up with the main points at dispute between Romanist and non-Romanist. They have produced, and are still producing, good scholars and brilliant books, but always within certain limits. If any first-rate historian wrote now a general Church history, after the plan of all other good histories, frankly facing all important questions on either side, he would find himself relegated to the Index far more promptly than Duchesne did. Meanwhile, however, much show is kept up by a few really able and well-written books in France and Germany, and by occasional journalistic indiscretions which suggest to the superficial reader that all cards are being laid frankly on the table. Yet there, again, we have a close parallel in the only other equally strictly-disciplined international institution, the Soviet régime. That Red Internationalism follows, naturally enough, on the lines of what lay folk in Italy sometimes nick-name " Black Internationalism." Here is the *Times Literary Supplement* on a recent book, *In the Land of Communist Dictatorship* (Dec. 19th, 1929). The author, A. V. Baikaloff " is a Russian Socialist; and his book condemns the Soviet Government out of its own mouth, so to speak, by quotations from Russian journals. He says that some readers may wonder why the Bolshevist censors allow such outspoken criticism to appear in the official press. He continues :—

'The explanation is that the Bolshevist journalists and writers, while criticising separate shortcomings and irregularities, never attempt to take the broad view and say that not individual Soviet officials, but the very system of political and economic dictatorship, is responsible for the dreadful conditions under which Russian workers live and toil.'

" He goes on to say that, if the Press did not reveal some of the crimes and offences well known locally, no one would read the papers; and the authorities want their papers to be read for the sake of the propaganda. This does not seem to explain the occurrence altogether fully. The disclosures are usually made at the numerous congresses and conferences held in accordance with the policy of Lenin, who said, 'Let them have meetings and talk.' He thought it would be a safety-valve and would not matter much for the time being, for he hoped and expected that things would improve. The editors cannot suppress everything unfavourable, because the people are keen about their grievances and expect them to be reported. Had the conditions improved, as expected, it would not have mattered much; but as the years go by without bringing any substantial improvement, and in some important respects things get worse instead of better, the grievances have a cumulative effect and become serious obstacles to propaganda. Moreover, they read quite differently in other countries where people can make comparisons with their own conditions, which is impossible for the residents of Soviet Russia. How serious the case is getting may be seen from the fact that two editors have recently been expelled from the Communist Party by a disciplinary commission for representing conditions in the U.S.S.R. in an unfavourable light and for attempting to criticise the present policy of the party at a meeting attended by rank-and-file Communists." *Mutatis mutandis,* this is exactly what can be said of the Roman Church. Its frankest official pronouncements, naturally enough, were blurted out in its days of dictatorship, or at least in days when complete victory seemed again within reach. The frankest pronouncements of its individual champions, no less naturally, are in private letters, published after many years either by non-Romanists, or by Romanists who knew that others besides themselves had already seen these tell-tale documents.

On this point it is most important to note the attitude of Dom Cuthbert Butler, one of the ablest and most temperate of Ultramontane champions. He writes (*The Vatican Council,* Vol. II., p. 187): "A letter of Hefele's in the time of struggle was disloyally made public against him." Why *disloyally?* It was, in itself, a semi-public, perhaps even in the strictest sense a public document. As soon as the Infallibility Decree had been passed, the Papal Curia began to put heavier and heavier pressure upon the minority of bishops who had steadily protested against it at the Council. This disgusted many intellectuals in Germany; and a committee of four Catholic professors at the University of Bonn, chosen to express this discontent, drew up a letter which they sent to six bishops from whom they hoped steady resistance to the very last. Four answered that they had already given in; Hefele and Strossmayer alone promised to continue their resistance. Here was a public question of the greatest importance; a bishop bound by the responsibility of his office not to conceal his views from the public; and a committee of earnest men, his personal friends, who had every right to ask him whether he was ready to continue, with them, the protest against what he and they had more than once publicly stigmatised as a fatal injustice. Hefele's letter showed plainly that he was still on their side, though desperately harried by his persecutors.[1] When, some months later, he had yielded to the Pope and abandoned them and broken his explicit promise of that letter "I will not publish the new dogma in my diocese," how can the Bonn professors possibly be condemned as "disloyal" for publishing the epistle in full? Hefele, in his later reply, pleads "I wrote that letter in the time of my inward conflict"; but does this deprive the world of the right to know the true facts? The inward conflicts of these bishops are among the most important factors in the true story of the Vatican Council; a bishop's private mind is not his own only, it belongs also to the public; it is among the depositories of Church tradition; and who is to know the true Christian tradition if the bishop's real mind may not be revealed? Hefele's inward conflicts are in fact a measure of the breach which the Vatican Decree had made with the true

---

[1] It is printed in full, with explanation of the whole circumstances, in J. F. v. Schulte, *Altkatholicismus,* 1887, p. 223; cf. 112.

Catholic past. They show how long he held out, even against the most terrible outside pressure, until at last he realised how inexorably he was held in the grip of that Power concerning which, during those weeks of agony, he wrote to his friend Döllinger: "What does Rome care about men's consciences, so long as they satisfy her lust of domination?" The whole of the letter to this Bonn committee is a document of the greatest historical value; for instance, we read: "Here in [my diocese of] Rottenburg I can no more blink the fact than I did in Rome that the new dogma lacks all true and genuine foundation in the Bible and in tradition," even though "almost the whole episcopate of Germany changed their minds, so to speak, in a single night, and some of them have gone over to an Infallibilism of the most persecuting kind. . . . The Bishop of St. Gall will hold out like me as long as he can; but when at last the knife is laid to his throat, he will submit." No historian would attempt to belittle the value of this kind of evidence in a letter from an Anglican bishop to an Anglican committee of four Oxford or Cambridge professors; and this attitude on the part of so able and moderate a writer as Dom Butler speaks volumes for the atmosphere in which he lives. To have concealed Hefele's inward struggles would have been to falsify the facts of the Vatican Council; it is in concealment that disloyalty lies.

What is more, I get increasing evidence that younger and more open minds in the Roman communion are impatient with what Newman called "doctoring all one's facts," and that they welcome revelations, even inconvenient, so long as they are true. They do not desire to live in a Ghetto of their own; in England, *Order* uses that invidious simile, just as Mumbauer had used it in Germany. Nor can we altogether trust the daily and weekly and monthly journals to let in all the fresh air that is needed. We may say to a certain extent of Britain, what is notoriously true of the United States, that there are two forces against which, in the mass, no Editor dares to wage war; Romanism and Judaism. Each of these wields the weapon of the boycott with terrible effect; and it matters little whether of these two institutions has learned it from the other, or whether each has hit upon it separately. In any case, this is one of the most formidable of modern weapons in the hand of any party which is sufficiently concentrated in its sense of separation from the rest of society to act with that unreflecting unanimity which is one of the weakest moral points in nationalism. International sectarianism may distort our journals as fatally as national prejudice.[2]

Therefore it is the aim of this present book to expose what no journal appealing to the general public can expose with the independence and consistency which are needed to counteract a most persistent campaign of historical misrepresentation. Nobody knows better than myself that, in one sense, I am wasting time and money here; moreover, that I shall rather lose than gain in what authors value sometimes even more than time or money. Readers of my other volumes are apt to suspect that a writer who attacks certain abuses constantly and emphatically must necessarily be dominated by a one-sided view of the general march of mankind. How far this may be true, time will show, when others who think differently come to deal with mediæval civilisation without neglecting the documentary evidence upon which, it is possible, I am laying disproportionate emphasis. Yet most of us, especially towards the end of life, must needs restrict ourselves more and more to the points that to us seem more and more certain; and I hope that the stress laid in these two volumes upon a few important considerations, taken together with my readiness to correct without delay any errors of fact which may be brought to my notice, may now leave me free to turn away from the negative side of history to that more constructive work in which all authors must have more sense of creation, and, therefore, more personal satisfaction.

---

[2] I give fresh and even more significant evidence in *In Defence of the Reformation*.

Especially have I a right henceforward to lay emphasis on the 1,325th Canon of the new Code of Papal Law, and to demand an ecclesiastical certificate of competency from Romanists who attack me. For this recent pronouncement repeats and enforces what I have already quoted from St. Thomas Aquinas and Cardinal Lépicier (Vol. I., p. x.), that no Romanist has a right to dispute publicly with outsiders on matters concerning the Faith, except he have a licence from the Holy See or from the bishop in whose diocese the disputation takes place. If this canon were more strictly obeyed, it would be better, not only for the Roman Church itself, but for outsiders who, when they take real pains to get at the facts, are howled down by self-appointed champions of the Faith.

APPENDICES.

Appendix I. (pp. 49, 146).

The final excommunication of Abbé Turmel (for whom see p. 144 of the present volume) is significant of the modernism which still lives underground. Nearly forty years ago, as Lecturer in Theology at Rennes, he first came under suspicion, and was removed to the chaplaincy of a convent. Since then, under seventeen different aliases, he has published heretical books and pamphlets. Once at least, and I think oftener, he recanted, but without change of mind. He has at last been convicted, and, at the end of 1930, has been subjected to the major excommunication and perpetual suspension from priestly functions. He is thus stigmatised as *vitandus*—"untouchable." If he sets foot in any Roman church, the service must at once be suspended; no Roman Catholic may associate with him or speak to him; all must leave the room when he enters.

But it is very rare for matters to come to this point; the usual course is that suggested to Houtin by the Marchese Vitelleschi: "do not let a condemnation spoil your breakfast . . . . submit, and continue to submit." Then, as a rule, the hierarchy is only too glad to wink at the rest as far as possible.

Appendix II. (p. 84).

The incident here quoted exemplifies admirably the shortsightedness of optimistic thinkers who, in their speculations, ignore the fundamental commitments of a smooth-speaking (and, for the present, perhaps equally well-meaning) organisation.

Mr. Robertson argues that the practice of plunder in land war is dead, and is evidently convinced that, if the Germans could enter London as conquerors, they would "loot nothing" (p. xxiv.). He casts ridicule on those naval experts who, "oblivious of the whole technique of their own vocation, tell us how in certain seas an enemy could take our merchant ships by the score (securing them, apparently, without manning them, or else destroying them and their crews in defiance of all international law and practice)" (p. xi.). And finally, he is indignant with Mr. Bowles for so interpreting a certain German declaration as to make it mean that, in case of necessity, Germany would subordinate considerations of humanity to considerations of victory in sea-warfare. The German declaration is, in fact, very much like Leo XIII's famous sentence in the Encyclical *Immortale Dei;* for though this is humanitarian on the surface, and lends itself admirably to quotation by those who would lull our suspicions, it yet reserves, at bottom, the Pope's immemorial claim to coerce non-Romanists when he has the power. "Mr. Bowles," argues Mr. Robertson, "would make out Germans in general to be even more fools than knaves—fools enough to avow their intention of knavery. Serious political discussion must rise above such dialectic as this." Yet, less than four years after this *reductio ad absurdum* was printed by a prominent member of Parliament, we had a frank confession from the law-Professor J. H. Morgan, who, until the war came, had shared Mr. Robertson's dislike of the "scaremongers." Professor Morgan, enlightened by actual events, pointed out in the *Times* that the German illegalities in Belgium now gained double significance from German pre-war pronouncements; that whatever they were doing now, in defiance of humanity, was simply what they had always talked of doing in case of necessity. All this is exactly analogous to the present-day argument that the Pope and his Professors at Rome cannot really mean the things which are sometimes even explicitly preached by them, and always left uncontradicted, though all past doctrine and practice preaches them. If the Vatican really means to abjure those doctrines which justified the mediæval Inquisition, it does great injustice to itself and to Society by not publishing this decision in unambiguous language.

Appendix III. (p. 94).

Governor Smith wrote as follows against Mr. Marshall in his article headed *Catholic and Patriot* (*Atlantic Monthly,* May, 1927, p. 724; the heavy type is mine): "Similar criticism can be made of many of your quotations. But, beyond this, by what right do you ask me to assume responsibility for every statement that may be made in any encyclical letter? As you will find in the *Catholic Encyclopædia* (Vol. V., p. 414), these encyclicals are not articles of our faith. The *Syllabus* of Pope Pius IX., which you quote on the possible conflict between Church and State, is declared by Cardinal Newman to have 'no dogmatic force.' You seem to think that Catholics must be all alike in mind and in heart, as though they had been poured into and taken out of the same mould. **You have no more right to ask me to defend as part of my faith every statement coming from a prelate than I should have to ask you to accept as an article of your religious faith every statement of an Episcopal bishop, or of your political faith every statement of a President of the United States.** So little are these matters of the essence of my faith that I, a devout Catholic since childhood, never heard of them until I read your letter. Nor can you quote from the canons of our faith a syllable that would make us less good citizens than non-Catholics. In fact, and in truth, I have been taught the spirit of tolerance, and when you, Mr. Marshall, as a Protestant Episcopalian, join with me in saying the Lord's Prayer, we both pray, not to ' My Father,' but to ' Our Father.' "

APPENDIX IV. (p. 94).

GOVERNOR SMITH'S CREED.

(*The Atlantic Monthly,* May, 1927, p. 728.)

" I summarise my creed as an American Catholic. I believe in the worship of God according to the faith and practice of the Roman Catholic Church. I recognise no power in the institutions of any Church to interfere with the operations of the Constitution of the United States or the enforcement of the law of the land. I believe in absolute freedom of conscience for all men and in equality of all churches, all sects, and all beliefs before the law as a matter of right and not as a matter of favor. I believe in the absolute separation of Church and State and in the strict enforcement of the provisions of the Constitution that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. I believe that no tribunal of any church has any power to make any decree of any force in the law of the land, other than to establish the status of its own communicants within its own church. I believe in the support of the public school as one of the corner stones of American liberty. I believe in the right of every parent to choose whether his child shall be educated in the public school or in a religious school supported by those of his own faith. I believe in the principle of non-interference by this country in the internal affairs of other nations and that we should stand steadfastly against any such interference by whomsoever it may be urged. And I believe in the common brotherhood of man under the common fatherhood of God. In this spirit I join with fellow Americans of all creeds in a fervent prayer that never again in this land will any public servant be challenged because of the faith in which he has tried to walk humbly with his God."

APPENDIX V. (p. 110).

Compare this further quotation from *Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell;* the words form part of a letter to the Very Rev. L. Martin, General of the Jesuit Order (pp. 468—9).

" Strive how I will, I cannot bring myself to believe that when authorities almost ostentatiously despise the natural means of arriving at a just judgment, when their every utterance is fresh proof of their mental incompetence, when there is not the slightest reason for supposing them to be the recipients of miraculous guidance, that then in 'hearing them I am hearing God.' Neither in the government of the Apostles by Christ, nor in that of the Church by the Apostles, is there the slightest trace of that dominating, autocratic, arbitrary rule which the text in question is so often adduced to justify. This dictatorial regimen was imported from the State into the Church in a military age, when no other conception of government was possible and before men were ripe for the liberty written broad over the face of the Gospel. If Churchmen still cling to it after the age has abandoned it, they must expect to be cut off more and more from the general life and to be regarded as a *gens lucifuga,* wedded to principles subversive of the existing bases of social order and progress."

APPENDIX VI. (p. 111).

An illustrated compendium of the Life of the Venerable Anthony M. Claret. (Lodovic Printing Co., San Antonio, Texas, 1921.)

The book has full vouchers :

Nihil Obstat
Felix Beperet, C.M.F., D.D.
Censor Deputatus.

Prelo Mandari Potest
D. Zaldivar, C.M.F.
Superior Provincialis.

Imprimatur
✠ Arthurus Hieronymus
Episcopus Sancti Antonii.

It is specially commended by the Bishop of the Diocese: "I hail with delight the edition in English of the life of the Servant of God, the Venerable Anthony M. Claret. If this modern Apostle could infuse such a spirit of zeal and self-sacrifice in his sons, the Claretian Missionaries, whom we see at work in Mexico, South America and here in our own midst, may we not hope that the reading of this book in which his life, labors, sufferings and success and his apostolic spirit are laid before our eyes, will not only edify the readers, but stimulate in them a desire to do, likewise, big things for God and souls? Whether religious, priest or layman, we cannot love God without having within us the missionary spirit, zeal for the extension of Christ's Kingdom on earth. And since nothing draws us more powerfully than example, may the life of the Venerable Claret be read by many and enkindle in the hearts of many the fire that consumed him and enabled him to do so much for the Great Cause during his life.

✠ ARTHUR J. DROSSAERTS,
Bishop of San Antonio."

The smuggling anecdote runs thus in full (p. 40): "Once, when Father Claret was traveling from Mataro to Barcelona, he met on the road a man who was carrying a sack. While both were walking along, suddenly the stranger began to express consternation and wept bitterly, exclaiming: 'There comes one of the carabineers or custom guards and my sack contains tobacco which is contraband. I bought the tobacco to sell at a good profit to provide necessities for my family, especially for my poor children. Now that carabineer will confiscate it and I will be sent to prison.' Father Claret told the man to be calm and hand him the sack and the latter did so. When they came upon the carabineer he asked the priest what he had in the sack. Father Claret replied: 'Nothing but lentils,' the kind of beans that grow in that locality. The carabineer opened the sack and examined the contents which then appeared to be beans, and the priest and his companion proceeded on their journey unmolested. When the priest handed the sack back to the owner, it contained nothing but the tabooed article, tobacco."

Moreover, Claret is now well on his way to official canonisation (p. 103). "On the day of Archbishop Claret's death, as an indication that his virtues were to exalt him, the Aurora Borealis appeared in the northern sky. . . . Still another remarkable circumstance occurred during the requiem mass held in Gerona, Catalonia, Spain, there having been numerous such masses held in various and widely separated localities. When at the end of the absolution which follows the high mass the celebrant was about to intone the verse 'From the Gate of Hell, Deliver his Soul, O Lord!' he was mysteriously prevented and was rendered unable to so intone such expression. This demonstrated the fact that the soul of the Sainted Claret went straight to heaven without first passing through Purgatory. . . . His sepulcher was a glorious one, which was visited by thousands of pilgrims who prayed there and to whose supplications, through his intercession, succoring answers came. This glory reached its climax when the translation of his remains took place. . . . Ever since that time many thousands of persons have visited that sanctuary and knelt before that tomb where their devotions and earnest supplications for succor and benefactions have been many. . . . The informative process of the beatification of Archbishop Claret was begun in Vich in 1887 and was finished and sent to the Sacred Congregation of Rites in 1890. On December

4th, 1899, Pope Leo XIII. issued the decree for introduction of the cause of his beatification declaring him 'Venerable.' The officials of the Sacred Congregation have repeatedly asserted that they have never seen such a beautiful and important case as that of the Venerable Archbishop Claret. Accordingly, his wonderful life afforded a theme for a peroration before Pope Pius X. at the Consistories held in the Vatican, December 14th, 1906, and April 18th, 1907. On May 17th, 1904, the Sacred Congregation unanimously and without discussion, approved the apostolic process concerning the fame, virtues and miracles of the Venerable Archbishop Claret in general. . . . In conclusion, and appropriately in connection with the celebration of the golden jubilee of the death of this great apostle, his thousands and tens of thousands of admirers and clients devoutly and earnestly hope that some additional and great miracle may be wrought and witnessed that may render his beatification and canonisation certain and as soon as possible under the laws of the Church. Fiat, fiat!"

APPENDIX VII. (p. 119).

The Latin text of this decree runs: "Si quis dixerit, parem esse conditionem fidelium atque eorum, qui ad fidem unice veram nondum pervenerunt, ita ut catholici iustam causam habere possint, fidem, quam sub ecclesiae magisterio iam susceperunt, assensu suspenso in dubium vocandi, donec demonstrationem scientificam credibilitatis et veritatis fidei suae absolverint; anathema sit."

APPENDIX VIII. (p. 127).

(a.) Here is a further extract from an article by *Voces Catholicae* on the question "Is a Catholic University Possible?" (*Contemporary Review,* May, 1899, p. 629.)

"Are we Catholics free to accept, and, if we be teachers, to spread the well-established truths of natural and historical science, despite the clashing of some of them with theological definitions, or, at any rate, with the method of construing them now in vogue? . . . For many years past Church history has been very lugubrious reading, made up, as it is, mainly of events on which a Gibbon of the new Rome would seize with unholy joy. . . . The entire organisation of the Church has been brought to bear against contemporary science, on the ground that it is a powerful solvent of religious faith. . . . It is this system of coercion which renders a Catholic University impossible." Therefore the writer feels compelled now to speak out, and thus to "withdraw from what seem to us grievous abuses the further support of sorrowful and, it may be, sinful silence."

(b.) The late Baron F. v. Hügel wrote as follows in a public letter to Dr. Briggs (*The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch,* quoted by Putnam, *Censorship of the Ch. of Rome,* Vol. II., p. 472).

"The cultivated non-Roman Catholic world is, in part unconsciously, often slowly yet everywhere surely, getting permeated and won by critical standards and methods. A system cannot claim to teach all the world and at the same time erect an impenetrable partition-wall between itself and the educated portion of that world. . . . This opinion of the Biblical Commission is surely but one link in a chain of official attempts at the suppression of Science and Scholarship, beginning with Erasmus and culminating with Richard Simon and Alfred Loisy, but never entirely absent, as witness the lives of countless workers, well known to their fellow-workers. . . . . When and where has Rome finally abandoned any position, however informal and late its occupation, and however demonstrated its untenableness? Where, in particular, is the case of its permission to hold critical and historical views even distantly comparable in their deviation from tradition to those here presented by us? But if no such cases can be found, then, surely, Rome stands utterly discredited . . ."

Appendix IX. (p. 134).

The quotations in the text may be further illustrated from two more from Ward's *Life* (Vol. I., pp. 475, 503, 565—7).

(a.) *The Rambler* was a Review on which the principal figures were Acton and Newman; it was founded in order to redeem the Roman Church in England from its intellectual torpor. Its prospectus boasted: " Modern society has developed no security for freedom, no instrument of progress, no means of arriving at truth which we look at with indifference or suspicion." But "Protestants prophesied that it was too able to be allowed to last": and this proved true. For Newman, unfortunately, contributed an article emphasising the notorious fact that, in the years following the Council of Nicæa, the laity were more passionate and steadfast than the bishops in opposition to Arianism. " The average English Catholic reader at that time," writes Ward, " was little accustomed to a thoroughly historical treatment of such episodes. Theologians at Ushaw and elsewhere accused Newman of declaring that the teaching Church had proved fallible after the Council of Nicæa. And Dr. Brown, Bishop of Newport, formally delated the article to Rome as heretical. Newman's defence was quite unanswerable, and after it had been understood in Rome the matter was finally dropped—as we shall see later on. His reply was made public at a subsequent period. In the first place his facts were historically accurate, as he had no difficulty in showing. . . . But the essay had been impugned. The suspicions of Rome had been aroused in connection with an article by Newman himself, in the already suspected *Rambler*. Although

Rome did not take official action in the matter, the Holy Father was reported to be pained; and the rumours of the hour proved to have had the effect of shaking the public confidence in Newman. His position in the Catholic body was not again for a long time to come what it had hitherto been in this respect.

"During the succeeding year—from July, 1859 to July, 1860—Newman continued to contribute to *The Rambler*. . . . Had the English Bishops appreciated the value of the work the Review was attempting, and dealt with it in a spirit of greater sympathy, possibly enough the moderation of tone for which Newman was so anxious might have been achieved. But the fact leaked out that even Newman's editorship, undertaken in a spirit of entire loyalty to constituted authority, had come to an end owing to episcopal intervention. This rumour gave edge to the feeling of the younger writers, that, in matters intellectual, nothing would satisfy the Bishops but such a following of the beaten track as would help no mind that was alive to the urgent questions of the hour."

Other plain-spoken articles caused even greater offence, and *The Rambler* soon came to an end.

(b.) Pius IX., in 1864, published a brief which "emphatically asserted the claims of scholastic theology and the Roman Congregations, as having authority even over the speculations of Catholic men of science." Therefore, "the Editors [of *The Rambler*] indicated their submission [to the Pope] by suspending publication." Consequently, "Newman set himself to examine the Munich Brief, of which he has left a careful analysis. He came to the conclusion that its directions made it impossible for him to deal as a Catholic writer with the controversies raised by the positive sciences. Silence on such subjects was his only course for the time. He writes as follows: 'I thought it was commonly said that Galileo's fault was that he meddled with *theology*, and that, if he had confined himself to *scientific conclusions* he would have been let alone; but surely the language of the brief . . . is as if even men of science must keep *theological* conclusions before them in treating of *science.* Well, I am not likely to investigate in science—but I certainly could not write a word upon the special controversies and difficulties of the day with a view to defend religion from free-thinking physicists without allowing them freedom of logic in their own science. So that, if I understand this brief, it is simply a providential intimation to every religious man, that, at this moment, we are simply to be silent, while scientific investigation proceeds—and say not a word on questions of interpretation of scripture, etc., etc., when perplexed persons ask us—and I am not sure that it will not prove to be the best way.' "

APPENDIX X. (p. 145).

From Bernard Holland's preface to *Selected Letters of Baron F. v. Hügel,* p. 31.

"The Baron, in these troublous times, often feared that he himself would, like Tyrrell, be deprived of the sacraments, and as late as 1913, when some non-Catholic friends were arranging for an invitation to M. Loisy to visit Oxford, asked, although he did not disapprove, that his name should be kept out of the matter, lest he should suffer this loss, since, as he wrote, the cup of official grievance against him was already filled almost to overflowing. Probably there was not much danger of this, although he was certainly regarded at Rome with suspicion and treated with coldness down to the end of his life. His books were not condemned. Dom Butler, O.S.B., formerly Abbot of Downside, said, in a record in *The Tablet* after the Baron's death: 'The Authorities no doubt knew the religious influence he was wielding in circles outside the Catholic Church, and did not think it advisable that that influence should be weakened, or that work impeded, especially as the writings were of a kind little likely to be read by many beyond those for whom they were intended; and also the Authorities well knew the man himself.' "

Lord Acton's case was similar; he would pretty certainly have been excommunicated but for fear of scandal. Dr. Figgis writes, in the *Dictionary of National Biography,* speaking of the Infallibility Decree :—

"Acton for the time stood aside and was unmolested. But when in 1874 Gladstone issued his pamphlet on 'The Vatican Decrees,' the publication of which Acton had not approved, he denied in letters to the *Times* any such danger to the state as Gladstone anticipated from possible Roman Catholic sedition owing to their allegiance to a foreign bishop. Yet Acton, while defending his co-religionists in England, dealt subtle thrusts at the papacy. He made it clear that what preserved his allegiance and minimised his hostility to the Vatican Decrees was a sense that the Church was holier than its officials, and the bonds of the Christian community were deeper than any dependent on the hierarchy. Acton was therefore able to speak of communion in the Roman Church as 'dearer than life itself.' His present attitude, however, was suspected by the authorities. Archbishop Manning more than once invited an explanation. Acton replied adroitly that he relied on God's providential government of His Church, and was no more disloyal to the Vatican Council than to any of its predecessors. After more correspondence, Manning said he must leave the matter to the Pope. Acton made up his mind that he would be excommunicated, and wrote to Gladstone that the only question was, when the blow would fall. But it did not fall. Perhaps as a layman, perhaps as a peer, less probably as a scholar, he was left alone, and died in full communion with the Holy See."

Appendix XI. (p. 226).

The following two letters throw, perhaps, even more light than those printed in Vol. I., App. III. to Preface, upon Mr. Belloc's unrepentant attitude towards easily-verifiable facts.

In *The Nation and Athenæum* I had pointed out, among other more important errors, the absurdity of his exaggerations about the Black Death, and, especially, of his adopting without suspicion the fable that 57,374 souls died of plague in Norwich alone, at a time when even London had not so many inhabitants, and Norwich not a quarter of the number. This led to a long correspondence, of which I here reprint the last two letters; they appeared in the issue of May 26th, 1928.

"Mr. Belloc's retreat is marked by a line of abandoned guns and wounded. He has told us that non-Catholics do not understand the Catholic mind; but presumably there are some Catholics who do. May we, therefore, appeal to one of these, as pious and learned (if the hyperbole be not too extravagant) as Mr. Belloc himself, to explain how 57,374 souls could die in the Black Death out of 50,000, and how this can be a 'typical figure' (page 37)? Let him then pass on to make it plain to non-Catholics how Mr. Belloc knows that a note is contemporaneous, when the paper on which it is written was bought nearly 200 years after 1349; and, again, that those who differ from him are ignorant of the records; and that Norwich had only 12 tithings, whereas we can count nearly 160; and that the average church had room for 1,000 worshippers; and that 5,000 people lived within the priory walls, with another 5,000 in the castle and the small space outside its towers. For, while Mr. Belloc accuses me of evasion, these are among the points which he leaves unexplained. He now changes his ground; the question of numbers (he pleads) will hardly be connected by any sane person 'with the authority of falsehood of Catholic doctrine.' Yet this whole discussion has grown from his quotation of the 57,374 and three similar figures as 'typical' proofs of his theory that the Black Death gave to English thought a 'twist' which 'warped' it, and thus contributed largely to a wicked revolt against Catholic doctrine some two centuries later. If, however, he now really wishes to travel into wider fields, he may lay himself open there to worse exposures than any but the first of those points which he is silently abandoning. May I, therefore, if only to give him no further excuse for alleging evasion, ask him plainly here for the necessary permission to print this present correspondence, at my own cost, as a specimen of the stuff which passes for history among Roman Catholics in this twentieth century? I am posting this within a few hours of reading his letter, in order that there may be time to send him a proof, and to get a categorical reply at the end of my challenge in this very number. If, as on two exactly parallel occasions already, that reply is in the negative, then your readers may judge whether it is mere perversity on my part which accounts for Mr. Belloc's complaints that 'everyone with whom [Mr. C.] comes to loggerheads turns out, by a strange coincidence, to be of my communion!' After all, I have never condemned modern Roman Catholic historians in such severe language as was used, in private correspondence, by the faithful Catholics, Newman and Acton.

"Let me, however, end again with a confession. Now, for the first time, Mr. Belloc has produced an argument of real value. It does seem possible that Mr. Hudson and I were mistaken in assuming that boys were actually included, as they certainly ought to have been, in these tithing-rolls. Even here he is not strictly accurate, nor does he produce any reasons for eliminating the servants, but he does make it probable that his own chosen multiplier of five was nearer the truth than even my second suggestion of three and a half.

When, however, we have eliminated his other blunders, this would only bring us to a total of about 14,000 souls, not 20 per cent beyond the extreme limit which I had suggested."

The reply ran :—

"It is very kind of you to have sent me the proof of Dr. Coulton's letter, which I return. I do not propose, myself, to add anything more to this interminable correspondence. I must also thank you for your courtesy in having printed so many letters of mine in connection with it."

The reader may gather a good deal of similar evidence from the Introduction and Appendices to my *In Defence of the Reformation.*

APPENDIX XII. (p. 265).

Gerson's teaching, as a whole, is thus summed up by Abbé D. Bouix, himself an ardent Infallibilist, in a book written as a preparation for the discussions of 1870 (*Tractatus de Papa,* 2 vols. 1869; Vol. I., pp. 476ff). Gerson (writes Bouix) taught as follows :—

"That an Œcumenical Council alone is infallible in definitions of faith; that Papal definitions do not oblige us to believe, but only not to dogmatise against them; however, if any man find a manifest error in Papal definitions, he may and ought to dogmatise against them; and, if it so befall that he be subjected to excommunication or pains, happy is he, as one who suffers for righteousness' sake. . . . It may happen that we are more bound to believe, in a matter of dogma, some learned man than the Pope's definition . . indeed, we must rather believe in the Gospel than in any other human authority whatsoever, that of the Whole Church alone being excepted. . . . The Pope is not the Head of the Church Universal. . . . It might befall that the Church of Christ should be reduced to one single believer; moreover, that the case may be imagined in which a General Council might lawfully be convoked by a poor old woman. . . . . . . In the Primitive Church, all Bishops were of equal power with the Pope. . . . The Pope has no power of binding and loosing if he be in mortal sin or ignorant of theology. . . . A Pope who falls into heresy is not deposed *ipso facto,* but ought to be deposed. . . . One of the constitutions promulgated by Martin V. at the Council of Constance was in fact heretical."

APPENDIX XIII. (see Preface).

In going through my papers again, I was sorry to find that I had carelessly forgotten a definite promise made to Fr. F. Woodlock, S.J. The following two letters will explain; the first was in answer to my challenge as printed in Vol. I., p. 114.

"I am not attracted by your suggestion of a public debate on 'Infallibility' or 'The Causes of the Reformation' as a means of dissolving what you describe as the 'absurdity' of 'a slightly ridiculous situation' in the controversy between Catholics and non-Catholics. I am inclined to agree with that learned historian and theologian, Bishop Gore, who, after a long and friendly discussion of the Papacy with Mgr. Batiffol at Malines, wrote: 'The interchange of controversial conclusions seems to go on for ever without any issue. It would seem as if something deeper than historical considerations really determines our respective convictions.' (*Christian East,* June, 1924, p. 65.) Mgr. Batiffol has said, as a result of his study of the Anglican controversy, 'Anglican theologians will not consider any facts but those which tell against Rome.' He wrote this before the appearance of Dr. S. H. Scott's *Eastern Churches and the Papacy.* I do not know if he was acquainted with your controversial writings. If no real progress towards agreement has been made by prolonged controversies, carried on with the deliberation and opportunity for weighing the context of citations from authorities which is possible in published books and newspaper correspondence, it is not likely that any result will be reached by a verbal debate even were it prolonged to the duration of, say, the sessions of the Vatican Council. So I must decline to adopt the rôle of David to your Goliath in any debate you may stage. May I beg that, should you wish to connect my name with any publicity you may plan to give to your challenge, you will publish in full my letter declining your invitation."

June 11th, 1929. "Certainly, as you request it, I shall publish the full text of your refusal. But are you not a little confused in your Scripture history? David, so far as I remember, did not complain that Goliath's obliqueness of vision, and the necessary conditions of the contest, rendered the idea futile. He was convinced of the justice of his own cause, and in that conviction he found success."

Thus, it will be seen, I was definitely pledged to print Fr. Woodlock's letter when I referred to the incident in Vol. I. I can only do my best to repair this omission here, with a public apology for my unintentional, but careless, breach of promise.

APPENDIX XIV.

Mr. Shane Leslie's interesting *Memoir of J. E. C. Bodley*, just published, supplies such strong corroboration of many points mentioned in this volume, that I cannot pass it by without a brief notice. Bodley was one of the acutest and most accurate observers of modern France, and one chapter of Mr. Leslie's book gives fragments of extraordinary interest from the volume which Bodley, unfortunately, never finished, on the Church in France. They entirely bear out Abbé Lugan's judgment on the mischievous interference of the clergy with secular politics, and their unconquerable prejudices and credulity in the matters of Dreyfus and Freemasonry. The following extracts are selected from among many more, sometimes even more emphatic, but longer (pp. 308, 323, 330).

" Note that Montagnini couples Dreyfusism with heterodoxy and anti-militarism. The Church learned nothing from the harm it did itself by identifying itself with anti-Dreyfusism. This correspondence is a confirmation of the fatuous folly it displayed on that occasion " (i.e. the Dreyfus Affair).

" The Church thus entered into political warfare with the Republic, and, however little an impartial spectator may like that form of government, he cannot be surprised that, being defeated in the struggle, the Church has had to undergo the penalty of the vanquished. Nor can he wonder that the policy of the Republic has been to take the education of the young out of the hands of a power so profoundly hostile to it." In France, of course, not even the Catholics in the Chamber are able seriously to face a vote on the question, on which Britain will probably give way, of State money granted for the subvention of Roman Catholic teaching in the schools.

" The Abbé Naudet, in his *Pourquoi les Catholiques ont perdu la bataille,* denouncing the folly of the Catholics who believed absurd legends about the diabolical cult of the Freemasons, narrates that in June, 1901, in the *Concours général de Catéchisme entre écoles Catholiques, classes élémentaires, division supérieure,* the question was put *'Y-a-t-il en France des idolâtres?'* and 20 out of 79 candidates answered, *'Oui, les Francs-maçons qui adorent le diable dans leurs réunions où il préside sous la forme d'un animal.'* "[1]

The natural result of this is, an anticlerical reaction which is as unenlightened and as prejudiced as orthodoxy itself; or, if possible, even more so. As Mr. Bodley writes (p. 310): "The political atheists, for whom M. Renan had as little love as they have share in his genius, are sectarian, fierce, narrow and coarse, and the day this law was passed to pacify them they were showing that if ever they obtain the upper hand their tyranny will be more pitiless than was ever priestly domination. At the Good Friday banquet held at the 'Maison du Peuple' by these self-styled apostles of free-thought, under the presidency of one member for Paris supported by another deputy, a poet and a person of relative culture, a parody of the entombment was performed, the body of the Man of Sorrows being represented by the carcase of a pig. This occurred the same week that the Socialist mayor of Roubaix prohibited the public carrying through the streets of his town of the last sacraments to the dying, on the ground of the alarm then caused to the citizens at the view of these symbols of mortality." In present-day Britain, thanks to the age-long persistence of different creeds side by side, such crude anti-religious abominations are as unthinkable as the abominable religious prejudices which were mobilised against Dreyfus. Anti-clericalism is the rebound from once victorious clericalism.

---

[1] General competition in Catechism among Catholic Schools : Elementary Classes, Upper Division. . . . . Are there any idolaters in France? . . . Yes, the Freemasons, who worship the devil at their meetings, at which he presides in the shape of some animal.

Quite as emphatic, to judge from a review in the *Times Literary Supplement* (Jan. 22nd. 1931) is the orthodox Roman Catholic Père Lecanuet in his two volumes on recent Church history in France. He confesses how long a time and what profound study it took him to realise the truth about Dreyfus, even after the heat of the "Affaire" was over; and concerning his fellow religionists he writes: "Even after the proof of Esterhazy's guilt and the discovery of the Henry forgery the Catholics persisted in believing that Dreyfus was guilty. Why? By a sort of national and religious obstinacy. Because all the enemies of our beliefs, Freemasons and Protestants, were on the other side; because we imagined a vast conspiracy of all the Jews in the world to rehabilitate the traitor; because, above all, the ministers of war asserted it. The Catholic journals never ceased repeating that the General Staff had secret documents which were absolutely certain and which could not be revealed without provoking war. Opinion was terrorised and fanaticised. Men believed in Dreyfus's guilt, for the conclusive reason that they could not prove this guilt either to France or to Dreyfus himself."

INDEX OF NAMES AND PLACES (NOT INCLUDING APPENDICES).

Achet, M., 24
Acton, Lord, 8n, 9, 10, 11, 42, 106n, 124, 163, 227, 247, 254, 301, 308
  on clerical education, 162
  on clerical ignorance, 165
  The History of Freedom, 7n, 125n
  on historical truth, 271, 305
  on Newman, 324
  and Papal Infallibility, 203
  Purcell on, 226
  on Ultramontanism, 14, 15
  And see Figgis, Janus
Adam, 197, 300
Addis, W., 46
Adhémar, Vicomte d', 143
Aeneid, see Knox
Africans, 272
Aix, Abp. Gouthe-Soulard of, 249
Alba, 199
Albertus Magnus, 246
Albi, Abp. Mignot of, 21, 44, 48, 143—4
Alexander VI., Pope, 199, 246
Alexandria, Library at, 118
  Patriarch of, 259
Allard, 143, 144
Allies, 253
Alzog, 260, 261, 264, 265, 267
  Church History, 257, 259
  and Infallibility decree, 204
America, 83, 98, 179, 219n
Americans
  bishops of, 10
  and *Syllabus,* 96
  Catholics in, 89, 98ff
  and Diana Vaughan, 216
  Freemasons in, 207, 213
  and *Index,* 129
Americans—*continued:*
  and Infallibility decree, 268, 270
  Jesuit Universities in, 167
  and Papal supremacy, 270
  Modernism in, 50
  Romanism in, Ch. VII.
  Romanism and Judaism in, 346—7
  and Roman claims, 86
  seminaries in, 161
  Sulpicians in, 34
  Volstead Act in, 127
  and Westminster Catholic Federation, 310
  And see Houtin
American Congress, 269
American Constitution (Governor Smith and), 76
"Americanism," 90
America, South, 53, 130, 223
  Infallibility decree in, 159
Anderledy, General of Jesuits, 136
Andrews, Eusebius, 319
Angelic Doctor, The, *see* St. Thomas Aquinas
Angers:
  Bishop of, 29, 35—6
  Houtin at, 20, 25, 29
  St. René of, 29ff
Anglicans, 80n
Anglo-Saxon countries:
  Labour and religion in, 222
"Anglos," 330
Anjou, 17
  La Revue d', 28
Annunzio, Gabrielle d', 190
Antoine, Père Charles, 65
Anthea, 138
Antichrist, 213, 214, 279

Antioch:
  Patriarch of, 259
  And see Harrent
Apostles, the, 1, 142, 170, 180, 342
  Creed of, 28, 313
  Gregory II. on, 228
"Apostolic halfpenny," 150
Apostolic See, 6
Aquaviva, 124
Aquileia, Council of, 230
Arc, Joan of, 214
Arcelin, 143
Argentré, d', *Collect. Judiciorum,* 256n
Arians, 2
Aristotle, 92n
Arizona, 322
Arlon, College of, 136
Armageddon, 223
Armagh, 331
Arras, 186
Asmodeus, 213, 214, 216
Astarte, 213, 214
Athenæum Club, 247
Atlantic, 8, 213
Austria:
  bishops of, and *Syllabus,* 96
  Jesuits in, 155
  Modernism in, 50
  Papal infallibility in, 5, 268

Babel, 67
Bacon, Francis, 124
  The Advancement of Learning, 130
Bacon, Roger, 169
Baikaloff, A. V., 343
Baines, Bp., 133, 253, 319
Baldwin, Mr. Summerfield, 75, 138
Bailly:
  Théologie, 257
Bâle, Council of, 261
Balliol, 323
Baltimore, *see* Gibbons
Baphomet, 214
Baptists, 80n
Baron, Monsieur, 21, 23
Baronius, Cardinal, 123
Barrett, Mr., 149, 245
  The Jesuit Enigma, 137
  on education of Jesuits, 167
Barry, Dr., and Loisy, 46
Bataille, 205, 217
Bathsheba, 170
Batiffol, 38, 143—4
Baudrillart, Mgr., 40, 53, 143
Bavaria, 12
  Jesuits in, 155
  King of, 12
Bayeux, Canon Marcel Hébert of, 36, 45
Bayle, Pierre, 230
Bazaillas, 143
Beaton, Cardinal, 242
Beauchamp, Lord, 239
Beck, Mr. Egerton, 287ff
  on Dives and Pauper texts, 291
Beelzebub, 214
Befana, la [Epiphany], 189
Belgium, 83, 84, 130, 179
  bishops of, and *Syllabus,* 96
  Jesuits in, 136, 156
  Labour Party in, 222
  religious education in, 197
  Royal Academy of, 175
Bellarmine, Cardinal Robert, 62, 109, 123, 229, 235
  And see Brodrick
Bellesheim, 243
Belloc, Hilaire, 117, 131, 217, 324, 333, 340
  and Armageddon, 223
  on Black Death, 325ff
  on Church and State, 103
  Church Times and, 335
  on Dreyfus, 218
  in *Listener,* 222
  on Oxford statistics, 328—9, 331
  and Prof. Pollard, 325n
  on the Reformation (causes of), 310
  on St. Thomas Aquinas, 339
  and science, 144

Belloc, Hilaire—*continued:*
  on writing of history, 172, 200ff
  And see Coulton
Benedict XIV., Pope, 65, 207
Benedict XV., Pope, 76
Benedictines, 20, 22, 25, 167, 195, 244, 305
  Houtin and, 26, 28, 37
  Houtin on, 19
  And see Solesmes
Benigni, Mgr., 89, 152, 321
Bennett, Arnold, 242
Benson, Fr. Hugh, 323, 336—7
Benziger Bros., 90
Berkeley, 124
Berlin, Taxil's works in, 211
Bernier, Canon Henri, 28
Besançon, Abp. of, 47, 100, 219, 238, 240
Beudant, Prof. Robert, 157, 158, 248n
Billot, Card., 86, 141n
Birkenhead, 178
Birmingham, 315
  Bishop of, 132
Bishop, Edmund, 287
Bismarck, 83, 84
Bitru, 213
Blondel, 143
Boccaccio, 297
  and Index, 124
Bohemians, 274
Bollandists, 29
Bolsheviks, 104, 122, 147, 343
  and censorship, 154
Bombay, Abp. Meurin of, 212
Bona, Card., 234
Bonal, 22
Boniface VIII., Pope, 74
Bonn, 204, 345—6
Booth, General, 187
Bordeaux, Abp. Lecot of, 220
  And see Narfon
Borghese, Prince Giovanni, 40
Bossuet, 7, 75, 109, 146, 197, 276, 324
  Declaration of the French Clergy, 5
  Histoire Universelle, 76
Boudinhon, Abbé, 126
Bourbon, Étienne de:
  Anecdotes Historiques, 170
Bourne, Card., 284, 310, 311, 314, 337
Bourrier, Abbé, 245
Bowles, Gibson, 84
Bowles, Miss, 115
Braeunlich, P., 212n
  Der Neueste Teufelsschwindel, 210n
Branly, 143
Breitung, 136
Bremond, Abbé, 146
  on Newman, 27
Brescia, Arnold, of, 260
Brinckman, 71n, 159n
Brischar, Fr., 198
Britain, 223
  Freemasonry in, 206—7
  and Index, 123, 124
  Romanism in, 16
  and Judaism, 346—7
  R.C. papers in, 322
  School control in, 312
British and Malta, 340—1
British Academy, 328
British Association, 58, 134
British Museum, 118, 124, 227, 285, 307, 311
British Parliament, 269
Britons, 179, 221
Brittany, 45
Brodrick:
  Life of Blessed Robert Bellarmine, 124, 125
Brors, F. X., 97
Browne, Sir Thomas, 124
  Religio Medici, 126, 130
Brunella, 189
Brunetière, Ferdinand, 49, 108, 143, 144, 177
Butler, Charles, 4
Butler, Dom E. C., 1, 9n, 13n, 15n
  Life of Bishop Ullathorne, 52n
  and Loisy, 46
  The Vatican Council, 344, 346

Byrne, 258, 261

Cabrol, *see* Farnborough, 26
Caesar, 88
Calvinists, 80n,
  and Dreyfus, 219
Cambrai, 246
  Abp. of, 5
  Bp. of, 41
  diocese of, 9
Cambrensis, Giraldus, 169
Cambridge, 256n, 259n, 289, 301, 332, 346
  Benson at, 323
  Bible Congress at, 284—5
  History of English Literature, 336
  Locals, 317
  papers, 299
  University Library, 272
Camm, Dom Bede, 289
Canada, R.C. clergy in, 146
  And see Marmande
Cano, Bp. Melchior, 118, 218
Canonists, 230
Cantimpré, Bp. Thomas of, 246
Capalli, Card., 237
Cardan, Jerome, 243
"Cardinal, The Green," 177
Cardoni, Abp., 159
Carlyle, 9n
Carrara, 188
Carson, W. R.:
  Reunion Essays, 13n
Castro, Alfonso de:
  Adversus omnes Haereses, 229
Cauderlier, 197
Cecil, Mr. Algernon, 337
Chaine, Léon, 87, 221, 319n
  Les Catholiques, 199
  Letter . . . on Dreyfus affair, 219—20
Chamberlin, Mr.:
  Character of Queen Elizabeth, 309n
Chapman, Abbot, 2, 226, 252ff, 324
Charleston, 208, 213, 214
Chaucer, 169, 297
  And see Coulton
Chénon, 143
Chesterton, G. K., 120, 131, 134, 138, 324, 334, 340, 341
  at Cambridge, 332
  Church Times and, 335
  on St. Thomas Aquinas, 339
  The Superstitions of the Sceptic, 116n, 332
  G. K's Weekly, 333
Chevalier, Canon Ulysse, 238
Chinese, 103
Choupin, Father Lucien, 96, 97, 140—1
  on *Syllabus,* 95
Cicero, 193, 200
Clapham, 58
Claret, *see* Cuba
Clarke, Richard, 192
Clement VIII., Pope, 229
Clement XII., Pope 207
Clifford, Lord, 3
Clongowes, 150
Clough, A. H., 17
Coeur, Abbé, 148
Cologne:
  diocese of, 9
  and Taxil's works, 211
Comestor, Petrus, 256
Commines, 224
Congo, 159
Congreve, 338
Constance, Council of, 9, 253, 261, 263
  (on Infallibility), 253—4
  (Œcumenical), 4
  decree of, 257, 261
  Fathers of, 263
  and Infallibility Decree, 261
  Theologians of, 264
Constantine:
  Forged Donation of, 228
Continent, Continentals, 206
  Freemasonry on, 207
  and Infallibility Decree, 225n
  Labour and religion on, 222
Copernicus, 62, 63, 123
Corelli, Marie, 135

Corvo, Baron, *see* Rolfe
Coulton, G. G., 287, 299, 330
  and Mr. Beck, 290
  and Father L. Walker, 302
  on Matthew Paris, 326—7
  on Oxford University statistics, 328
  Mr. Belloc as Historian, 310n
  Catholic Truth and Historical Truth, 295, 307
  Chaucer and his England, 327
  Death Penalty for Heresy, 301, 303
  In Defence of the Reformation, 339, 347
  Five Centuries of Religion, 309n
  Mediæval Village, 297, 309n
  Monastic Schools in the Middle Ages, 337
  Popular Romanist Church History, 297
  Roman Catholic & Anglican Accuracy, 298
  Roman Catholic Church and the Bible, 284, 339
  Roman Catholic History, 305
  Roman Catholic Truth, 301
  Some Inexactitudes of, 300
Coupe, Father:
  Infallibility, 294
Couissinier, Abbé, 197
Couturier, 30
Cowley Fathers, 27
Creighton, Bp., 277
Croix, Père Camille de la, 33
Cuba, Abp. Claret of, 111, 113
Cullen, Abp., 134
Curialists, 64
Czecho-Slovakia, 225n

Dandin, Georges, 88
Daniel, 61
Dante:
  De Monarchia, 123
  From St. Francis to D., 181
Darwin, Charles, 124
Darwin, Erasmus:
  Zoonomia, 124
Deanesly, Miss:
  The Lollard Bible, 232
Decarabia, 213
Dell, Robert, 65, 68, 174, 192, 193
Denis, Abbé Charles, 143
  on Latin Catholicism, 173
Denmark, 136, 231
Derry, Bp. of, 163n
Descartes, 68, 323
Desclée, 6
Desjardins, M. Paul, 14, 276, 286
Didon, Père, 221n
Dillon, Dr. E. J., 86, 127
Disraeli, 307
Dixon, Canon, 287
Döllinger, 7n, 11, 73 and note, 74, 204, 244, 255, 340, 346
  on clerical education, 164, 174
  on Decree of 1870, 146, 158, 203
  Purcell on, 226
  on Romanism and Republicanism, 87n
  on seminaries, 163
Dominicans, 64, 170, 296, 339
  and Dreyfus case, 221n
Donatists, 230
Downside, 179, 286
  Abbot Chapman of, 226
  on Döllinger, 12
Dreyfus, 184n, 218, 223, 247
"Dreyfusards," 219
Drury Lane, 191
Dublin, seminaries in, 163n
Dublin Review, The, 2n, 87n, 305, 319n
Duchesne, Mgr. L., 29, 38, Ch. IV., 143, 144—6, 192, 194, 204, 343
  elected to French Academy, 53
  Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise, 47, 54, 185—6
Duff-Gordon, *see* Waterfield
Duffy, Father, 92ff, 99, 104, 144

Duggan:
  Steps towards Reunion, 131, 181, 282
Duhem, 143
Duhr, 244
Dumas, 135
Dunan, 143
Dunfermline, Abbot of, 242
Dupanloup, 267
Dutch language, Bibles in, 232

Ebion, 326, 327
Egypt, 61
Einstein, 121, 122, 134
Eliot, George, 135
Elizabeth, Queen, 221, 336
  And see Chamberlin
England, English, 26, 83, 100, 165, 227, 298
  in America, 179
  Catholics in, 133
  (Newman on), 155, (and Index), 128, 129
  Catholic revival in, 44
  Clergy of, 27
  and Decree of 1870, 253, 268
  education in, 163, 188, (Catholic) 273, 313
  Gasquet on morality of, 277
  Index in, 122n
  Jesuits in, 127, 156, 244
  Labour and religion in, 222
  Papal infallibility in, 3
  Papal supremacy in, 269
  pre-Emancipation, 319
  Romanist Ghetto in, 346
  seminaries in, 161, 174
Ephesus, Council of, 230
Erasmus, 123
Ermoni, Père, 143, 145
Europe:
  E. and the Faith, 201
  L'Europe Nouvelle, 77n
  Freemasons in, 207
  Jesuit schools in, 156
  and papal infallibility, 4
  Universities of E., 256n, 289, 328
Eve, 197, 300

Faguet, Emile:
  L'Anticléricalisme, 318n
Fallois, Comtesse de, 247
Falloux, 187
Farnborough, Abbot Cabrol of, 26
Fathers, the, 23, 58, 227, 276
Fava, Bp., of Grenoble, 208, 212
Fawkes, Rev. A., 35, 87n
  Studies in Modernism, 41n, 55n, 165
  on Tyrrell, 56, 57
Febronius, *see* Hontheim
Feldkirch, Jesuit school at, 215
Fénelon, 42, 342
  Ecole Fénelon, 45
Fielding, 124
Figgis and Laurence:
  Selections from the Correspondence of Lord Acton, 15n
Firmilian, Bp., 253, 256
Fischer, Abp., 97
Fitzralph, 328—9, 331
Fleming, Dr. Hay, 242, 243
Florence, Council of, 61
  Inquisition at, 63
Fogazzaro, 47—8, 237
Foley, 244
Fonsegrise, 48, 143
  on *Pascendi,* 48
Foran, Canon:
  Monks and Nuns, 294
Forest Gate, Franciscan convent at, 135
Forshall and Madden, 278ff
Fort Augustus, Abbot of, 242
Foxe, 226, 254
France, 3, 16, 41, 87, 100, 130, 172, 260
  anti-clericalism in, 319
  "Apostolic halfpenny" in, 150
  Benedictines in, 22
  bishoprics in, 29
  bishops of, 165, 205, 321
  (and *Syllabus*), 96
  Church in, 54, 152, 164, 185, 320

France—*continued:*
  Church and State in, 87—8
  clergy of, 5, 44, 223
  (and Dreyfus case), 218
  (and laymen), 248
  (Newman on), 162
  Collège de, 55
  Corrispondenza Romana in, 241
  Freemasonry in, 205ff, 211
  Henry IV. of, 199
  and Infallibility Decree, 159, 268
  Jesuits in, 108
  laity in, 165, 181
  law of libel in, 240
  and Leo XII's Encyclical Letter, 200
  liberal clergy in, 53
  Maignen's book in, 90
  Modernism in, 47
  Pascendi in, 48
  Pius VII. and, 80
  Pius X. and, 251
  religion in, 39, 151, 156—7, 182, 221
  (and Socialists), 222
  religious education in, 188
  religious journalism in, 270
  Romanist literature in, 343
  seminaries in, 160
  Taxil's works in, 210, 217
  Universities (Catholic) of, 50
  women in, 162
Franciscans, 53, 134
Frederick II., 199
Freeman, 255
Freiburg, 194
Freising, 174
French Academy, 53
  in America, 179
  Constitution (Pius VII. on), 80
French Embassy, 233
French Government:
  and Tosti, 233
  Vatican and, 240
French language:
  Bibles in, 232
French politics:
  and Vatican, 238
French Republic:
  and Pius X., 251n
French Revolution, 80n
Friars, the, 331
Friedrich:
  Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils, 257
  Purcell on, 226
Frommann, Th.:
  Gesch. d. Vat. Concils, 267n
Froude, J. A., 227, 254
  and Freeman, 255
Funck, 143
Furniss, Father:
  Books for Children, 306

Gairdner, Dr., 307 and note
Galatians, 180
Galileo, 62, 63, 64, 123, 136, 141n, 265
Gallicans, 28, 45, 75
  and Papal Infallibility, 275
Gallitzin, 5
  Defence of Catholic Principles, 3
Gasparri, Card., 76, 202, 311
Gasquet, Cardinal, 195—6, 254—5, 286, 297, 331
  Egerton Beck on, 287
  Great Pestilence, 329
  Henry VIII. and English Monasteries, 277—8
  Monastic Life in Middle Ages, 281
  Old English Bible, 278, 280, 285
  on Sunday Mass, 282ff
Gaugain, Dom Léopold, 19, 21, 25, 26
Gayraud, M., 46
Geneva, 209
Genoa, 53
Gerard, Father, 295, 296, 307
German, Germans, 309
  historians, 258
German language:
  Bibles in, 232

Germany, 83—4, 172, 293, 340
  bishops of (and *Syllabus*), 96
  Catholics in, 82n, 127
  and Diana Vaughan, 215
  Freemasonry in, 209
  Houtin and, 26, 33
  and Infallibility Decree, 146, 268, 345, 346
  Jesuits in, 135, 243, 244
  Modernism in, 50, 52
  Papal infallibility in, 5, 11
  religion in, 187—8
  religious education, 188, 273
  Romanist Ghetto in, 346
  Romanist literature in, 343
  seminaries in, 161, 163
  Taxil's works in, 210, 211
Gerson, 4, 263
  on Infallibility, 263
Ghetto, The, 114, 188
  Romanism as, 172
  Romanist, 115, 346
Ghilardi, Bp., 159
Gibbon, 124, 326
Gibbons, Cardinal (Bp. of Baltimore), 90, 105
Gigli, 272
Giraud, Victor, 143
Gladstone, 324
  Vaticanism, 72
Goetz, L. K.:
  Ultramontanismus, 97n, 157n
Gore, Bishop, 2, 226, 252ff, 324
Gorman, Mr. F. J., 183n, 327n
Goupil, 27
Gouthe-Soulard, *see* Aix
Goyau, G., 143
Grand, Mrs., 135
Gratian, 283
  Decretum, 282
Gratry, Father, 162, 226, 234
Great Britain and Papal pretensions, 74
Greece, 161
Greek Church, 227
Greek Fathers, 256
Greek language:
  in Italian seminaries, 197
Greeks, 80n, 103
Greenwich, 191
Gregory II., Pope, 228
Gregory VII., Pope, 1
Gregory XVI., Pope, 81
Grenoble, 157, 248n
  Bp. of, 208, 210, 212 (and Taxil), 216
Grimault, Canon, 30
Grosch, Mgr., 187
Grüber, Fr. H., 209, 210
  and D. Vaughan, 215
Guéranger, Abbot, 26—7
Guiraud, J., 143
Guyot:
  Somme des Conciles, 257

Habbacuc, 61, 67
Habsburg, 199
Hacks, Dr., 209, 215, 217
Hadrian the Seventh, see Rolfe
Haggard, Rider, 135
Hague Conference, 84
Hahn, Professor, 136
Hallam, 308
Hamburg, 213
Hamilton, Abp., 242—3
Hanoverians, 207
Hanson, Mr. Eric, 315
Hardy, Thomas, 135
Harnack, 66
Harrent, Abbé, 145
  Schools of Antioch, 145
Harrow, 58
Harvard, 167
Hasenclever, 146
Hathaway, Anne, 187
Hébert, Marcel, *see* Bayeux
Hebrew, in Italian seminaries, 197
Hecker, Father, 90
Hefele, 11, 203, 236, 266, 344ff
  History of the Councils, 236
Hemmer, 143
Henderson, Mr., 222
Henry IV. [of France], 199
Henry VIII.:
  Lingard on, 308
  And see Gasquet
Hepling, Baron von, 44

Hergenröther, Card., 287
  Anti-Janus, 255—6
Herzog, Bp., 57
Higuera, Fr. de la, 228
Hobbes, 124
Hoensbroech, Count v., 137 155, 156, 244
  Fourteen Years a Jesuit, 135 198
Holland, Bernard, 144
Holland, bishops of, and *Syllabus,* 96
Holy Land, 198
Honorius I., Pope, 30n, 234, 236, 257
Hontheim, 5
Hope, J. F., 178
Hosius, 253
Houtin, Albert, 20, 21, 23, 43, 55, Ch. III., 192, 239, 255
  L'Américanisme, 89n, 90n
  Apostolicité, 228n
  Bible Question among the French Catholics in the Nineteenth Century, 34, 35, 36, 40, 246
  La Crise du Clergé, 34, 56, 115, 134, 153, 160, 164, 175, 186, 205
  My Difficulties with my Bishop, 37
  on Ermoni, 145
  on *L'Evangile et L'Eglise,* 46
  Hist. du Modernisme Catholique, 41n, 50n, 220n
  Ma Vie Laïque, 41, 42
  Prêtre marié, 31n, 240, 241, 248
  reasons for secession of, 227
  on Roman Catholicism and Republicanism, 87
  on seminary régime, 160
  and Tyrrell, 56
  Vie de Prêtre, 17, 153, 205
Hudson, Rev. W., 325
Hügel, Baron F. von., 44
  Eternal Life, 171—2
  and Mignot's letters, 144
Hugo, Victor, 2, 157
Hulst, Mgr. d', 152
Hun, Richard, 278, 279
  Hun's Bible, 286
Hungary, bishops of, and *Syllabus,* 96
Hunter-Blair, Abbot, 242—243
Huxley, 58, 124, 167, 339
Hyacinthe, *see* Loyson
Hyde, Father, 305

Inchofer, Melchior, 228
Independents, 80n
India, *see* Streicher
Innocent I., Pope, 259
Innocent III., Pope, 259
Innsbruck, 180
Institut Catholique, 40, 45
Ireland, 4, 306, 331
  Bishops and Emancipation in, 76
  Clergy in, 27
  Jesuits in, 150
  Priestly rule in, 130
  Priests from, 161
  seminaries in, 24n
  And see McCarthy
Ireland, Abp., 90, 105
  Life of Father Hecker, 89
Irish Free State, 310
Irish, 239
  and Infallibility Decree, 3, 71, 253
  papers, 297—8
Irenæus, 231
Islington, 187
Israel, 180
  And see Loisy.
Italy, 130, 238
  anti-Christian literature in, 129
  anti-clericalism in, 319
  Franciscans in, 53
  Freemasonry in, 209, 215
  Infallibility Decree in, 159, 268
  Jesuits in, 127
  Modernism in, 47, 50
  papers in, 321
  religious teaching in, 188

Italy—*continued:*
  seminaries in, 54, 197
  And see Waterfield
Italy, N., 260
Italian:
  bishops, and *Syllabus,* 96
  "bishopkins," 9
Italian language:
  Bibles in, 232
Italians:
  Loisy and, 46
  and Taxil's works, 210
Italian peasants:
  and religious teaching, 273

Jacobsen, Ida, 213
Jacquier, Abbé, 143
Janssen, Father, 309 and note
Janus, 12, 13n, 87n, 254ff
  Anti-, 257
Jehoshaphat, 180
Jehova, 212
Jekyll, Father, 305
Jenkins, Professor Claude, 299
Jerusalem, 208, 213
  Council of, 1
Jesuit, Jesuits, 3, 8, 33, 46, 47, 60, 65, 86, 97, 125—6, 149ff, 167, 175, 180, 192, 209, 228, 233, 235, 287, 296ff, 301, 305
  Anglicans on, 174
  and archives, 243
  and censorship, 135, 137
  in France, 108
  and Freemasonry, 208, 209, 210
  General of the, 141
  (Tyrrell's letter to), 57
  in Germany, 243
  and history, 198—9
  and literature, 135
  and Mariana's book, 244—5
  papers, 54, 315
  and Pope, 267
  scholarship of, 167
  and schools, 155
  and science, 58
  and Taxil, 215
Jesuit, Jesuits—*continued:*
  Tyrrell on, 55, 56, 57, 159, 304 (his letter to the General), 57
  And see Barrett, Hoensbroech, Menochius, Taunton
Jew:
Jews, 188, 199, 214, 218
  and oaths, 191
  as Pope, 214
Job, 191, 193, 200
Jogand-Pagès, Gabriel, 208
  Complete Revelations concerning Freemasonry, 209
  Secret Amours of Pius IX., 209
John XXII., Pope, 256 & note
Judea, 61
Julius I., Pope, 236

Kant, 45
Keenan, 5, 72, 109, 253, 276
  Catechism, 3, 71, 252, 275
Kelle, 243
Kenrick, Abp., 10, 11, 71n
Kent, Fr. W. H., 46
Kepler, 123
Ketteler, Bp., 82
Kirk, 308
Klein, Felix, 143
Knightsbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy, 303
Knox, Father Ronald, 117, 118, 122, 131, 171—2, 181, 314—15, 324, 335
  Belief of Catholics, 120n, 171, 180
  Spiritual Aeneid, 179, 323
Kraus, F. X., 143, 144, 194
Künzle, Father, 215
Kurth, 143

Laberthonnière, Fr., 47, 143, 144, 146
Lacordaire, 89, 148, 162, 270
  Life of, 19
  on Veuillot, 319
Lacroix, *see* Tarentaise
Lagrange, Père, 143
Lambert, M., 28

Lamennais, 89
Lang, Andrew, 124
Langres, Bp. of., 139
Languedoc, 259
Lapparent, M. de, 44, 143
La Rochelle, Bishop Lecamus of, 23
Larousse, 76n
  Grand Dict. Univ., 124
Lateran Council, 234
Latin nations:
  Catholics in, 127, 173
  Clericalism and anti-clericalism in, 221
  Labour and religion in, 222
La Tour Landry, Knight of, 169
Laurence, *see* Figgis
Lazarist Order, 145
Lazarus, 30, 32
Lea, H. C., 209, 297
  on Taxil lies, 206, 217
Leacock, Mr., 131
Lecamus, *see* La Rochelle
Lecomte, R., 159
Lecot, Cardinal, 220, 241
Leclère, 143
Ledoyen, Monsieur, 26, 27
Lee, Abp., Register of, 288
Lenin, 343
Leo X., Pope, and heretics, 23
Leo XII., Pope, 207
Leo XIII., Pope, 12, 35, 47, 58, 60, 79, 81, 96—7, 111, 126, 142, 152, 177, 193, 198, 200, 207—8, 217, 230
  and "Americanism," 90
  and Anti-Masonic Congress, 215; Biblical Commission of, 196; and Diana Vaughan, 214, 216; and Dreyfus case, 220
  Encyclicals of, 87, 229
  and Index, 125, 128
  his Letter to Prelates and Clergy of France, 119
  and Léo Taxil, 210
  And see Narfon.
Leonetti, Father, 246
Lépicier, Card., 86, 196n, 348
  De Stabilitate, etc., 119n
Le Roy, Edouard, 64, 182ff
Le Roy, Professor Jules, 75, 173
Leroy-Beaulieu, Anatole, 143
Lescher, Fr. W., 296, 298,
Letourneau, Père, 23, 24, 33
Lewes, G. H., 135
Liberius, Pope, 253
Liége, 198
Ligugé, 19
Liguori:
  Moral Theology, 159
Liguria, 53
Lilley, A. F.:
  Modernism, 173
Lincoln, Abraham, 131
Lingard, 308
Littledale, Dr., 71n, 252, 254
  Plain Reasons, 253, 274, 275, 277
Liverpool, 339
Locke, 124
Loir, R., 19
Loisy, Alfred, 38, Ch. IV., 143, 144, 146, 185, 186
  Autour d'un Petit Livre, 153, 203, 205
  L'Evangile et L'Eglise, 36, 46, 205—6
  excommunication of, 50
  and Houtin, 33, 37
  Quelques Lettres, 139
  La Religion d'Israel, 44
  and Tyrrell, 56
Lollards, 49
  And see Deanesly
Lombardy, anti-clericalism in, 319
London Catholic Herald, 178
London County Council, 310
  and school history books, 311
London:
  episcopal registers of, 278
  Matriculation, 313
  School of Economics, 321
Loretto, 238
  Holy House of, 33, 246

Louis XI., 224
Louis XIV., 75
Louvain, University of, 54
  and Duchesne, 54
  and Mivart, 58
Louvre, the, 191
Löwenstein, Prince v., 215
Loyson, Père Hyacinthe, 40, 45, 241
Luca, Prof. de, 86
Lucas, Father, 46, 133
Lucca, Tolomeo of, 256
Lucifer, 213, 214, 215
Luciferians, 208, 214, 216
Lugan, Abbé, 87n, 319n
Luther, 2, 209, 231
Lutherans, 80n, 213
  anti-, 229
  and Dreyfus case, 219
Luzerne, Card. de la, 146
Lyons, 148, 153, 219

Mabillon, 305
Macchi, Cardinal, 40
Machiavelli, 124
Maeterlinck, 125n
Magdeburg, 254
Maidstone, 181
Maignen, Abbé, 90
Maisonneuve, 30
Maitland, Prof. S. R., 227, 330
Maldonatus, 24n
Malines, 198
Malta, 112, 202, 214, 270, 310 and note, 341
  press restriction in, 318
Manichæism, 209
Manning, Cardinal, 10, 13, 52, 139, 224
  on *Syllabus*, 95
Margiotta, 209, 215, 217
Mariana, 244
Maria-Laach, 267
  Stimmen aus, 210
Mariannina, 189
Maritain, Jacques, 69
Markham, Admiral, 214
Marmande, R. de:
  Cléricalisme au Canada, 146, 318n
Marseilles, 208
Marshall, Mr. C. E., 75, 93, 94, 97n, 98, 100, 102, 103n
  The Roman Catholic Church in the Modern State, 92n
Marsilius, 235n
Marsille, Dom, 28
Martindale, Father, 2, 172
Mary, Queen, 199
Matteucchi, Luigi, 210
Maynooth, 24n, 248
McCabe, Mr. Joseph, 75, 134
  Life in a Modern Monastery, 167—8
  Twelve Years in a Monastery, 147, 166
McCarthy, Michael J. F., 248
  Priests and People in Ireland, 186
Mediterranean, Catholicism on, 239
Meissas, Abbé de, 139, 160
  La Foi chez les Prêtres, 160n
Melanchthon, 265
Menochius, 24 and note
Menuge, Canon:
  Sacred History, 197
Mercier, Card., 56, 143
Mermillod, 10
Merry del Val, Cardinal, 88, 139, 150, 152, 196, 202, 221n, 231—2, 238
"Merry Devil," 89n
Messina, 228
Meurin, Abp., *La Franc-maçonnerie*, 208, 212
Mexico, 221
Meyer, Paul, 219
Michael, Dr. E., 180
Michelet, 162, 179
Migne, 228n
Mignot, Mgr., *see* Albi
Milan, 243
  Cardinal Archbishop of, 50
Mill, J. S., 124

Milner:
  End of Religious Controversy, 58
Milner-White, Fr., 335
Minocchi, Abbé, 46
Mirbt:
  Quellen z. Gesch. d. Papsttums, 120n, 200n
Mivart, Dr. St. George, 47, 58, 64, 65
  Catholic Church and Biblical Criticism, 60
  on clerical edn., 166
  Happiness in Hell, 60
  The Cat, 58
Molière, 153
Moloch, 214
Mommsen, 243
Monod, Gabriel, 203, 219
Montagnini, Mgr., 89, 150, 151, 238
Montaigne:
  Essais, 123, 126, 130
Montalembert, Count, 153, 270
  on Jesuits, 156
  Monks of the West, 19
Monte, Cardinal del, 62
Monte Cassino, 233
Montgazon, 26
Montpellier, Grasset de, 143
Montreal, Abp. of, 318
Morgan, Prof. J. H., 83
Moriarty, Mgr., 178
Mormons, 104
Mugnier, Abbé, 241
Mumbauer, 114, 172, 188, 346
Mun, Comte Albert de, 240
Munich, 12, 204
  Abp. of, 174
  Congress, 164

Nantes, Edict of, 76
Napoleon, 2, 131
Narfon, Julien de, 49, 87n, 318
  Answer from Rome to the Assembly at Bordeaux, 241
  on Infallibility Decree, 176
  Pope Leo XIII., 152n
  Séparation, 107n, 153, 178, 251
Naudet, Abbé, 220
Nelson, 40
Nessus, 65
Newman, Cardinal, 5, 13, 20, 24, 48, 52, 66, 115, 132, 134, 154, 179, 191, 226, 254, 301, 305
  Acton on, 324
  his Doctrine of Development, 247
  on espionage, 147—8, 161
  on historical truth, 271, 305, 346
  Houtin and, 27
  and Mivart, 60
  and Perrone, 245
  and Ryder, 274
  on seminary education, 171
  on *Syllabus* of Pius IX., 95
  and Tyrrell, 55
  And see Ward
New York State, 99
  Abp. of, 104, 111
Nicæa, Council of, 253, 259
Nice, Bp. of, 239
Nicholas I., Pope, 107
Noah, 136
Nogent, Guibert de, 218
Norfolk, 310
Norwich, 325—6

Ockham, 169
O'Connell, 130
O'Flynn, Father, 117
Oliver, Dr., 277—8
Ollé-Laprune, 143
Ollive, Monsieur, 21
Ollivier, 15n
Omar, Khalif, 118
Orangeman, 93
Oratorians, 20, 22
Ordropshoj, 136
Ore, R.C. College of, 95
Origen, 275, 276, 326, 327
Ouida, 135
Oviedo, Pelayo of, 256
Oxenstierna, 134
Oxford, 112, 171—2, 289, 296, 301, 346

Oxford—*continued:*
  Belloc at, 218
  scheme for R.C. College at, 155
Oxford Locals, 317
Oxford University statistics, 328, 331
Ozanam, 148

Pabisch, 258, 261
  and Byrne, 261, 264—5, 267, 270
Pachtler, 211
Padua, University of, 289
Palatine Library, 118
Palestine, 238
Palladium, 213, 214
Palmieri, Domenico, 137
Papal States, 9
Parfait, Paul:
  La Foire aux Reliques, 112
  L'Arsenal de la Dévotion, 112
Paris, 49, 89, 150, 209, 247, 321
  Abp. of, 36, 46, 153, 186, 205, 238, (and Loisy) 44—5
  Bibliothèque Nationale, 33
  Bp. of, 45
  clerical free thinkers in, 36
  diocese of, 9, 35, 44
  Ermoni at, 145
  Freemasons in, 207
  Houtin in, 36, 40
  Institut Catholique, 50, 53, 54, 152
  Loisy at, 44
  Parlement of, 207
  professors (and Dreyfus), 219
  St. Sulpice, 33, 34
  Sorbonne, 45
  University of, 4, 9, 41, 256
Paris, Gaston, 219
Paris, Matthew, 326, 327
Parocchi, Card., 214, 216
Partington, Mrs., 8
Pascal, 34
Pastor, F., 309
Paulhan, M., 34
Paul V., Pope, 141n
Pelayo, *see* Oviedo
Pernot, Maurice, 87n, 114—5, 164, 188, 197, 321
  on Biblical Commission, 196
  Pie X., 165
  Politique de Pie X., 50, 241, 251n
Perrone, Father, 245
  Catechism of, 245
  Theology, 159
Persians, 134, 192
  "Persian lash," 236
Peter's Pence, 150
Petre, Miss M. D., 47n, 99
  Autobiography and Life of G. Tyrrell, 55n, 56n, 57n
  and encyclicals, 51—2
Peuportier, M., 35
Pharisees, 191
Philip II. (of Spain), 199
Philippe, Father A., 76ff
Piat, Abbé, 143
Pickwick, 204
Piou, M., 151
Pistoia, Council of, 91
Pius VI., Pope, 91
Pius VII., Pope, 80, 207
Pius VIII., Pope, 207
Pius IX., Pope, 8, 10, 15, 73n, 81—2, 96—7, 109, 207, 219n, 224—5, 231, 245, 270, 271, 345
  Syllabus of, 94—5
  Vatican decrees of, 119
  And see Jogand-Pagès
Pius X., Pope, 6, 38, 41, 49, 50, 53, 87, 111, 134, 139, 151, 178, 252
  and Duchesne, 54—5
  Lamentabili of, 47, 51, 53
  Pascendi of, 48, 50, 51, 53, 100, 108, 118, 139, 144—5, 147, 152, 247
  and *Mutualités ecclésiastiques,* 251n
  And see Pernot
Pius XI., Pope, 77, 123, 202, 238
  Index of, 124, 231
Plummer, Dr., 73n, 163, 174, 244

Pollard, Prof. A. F., 325
  and Belloc, 325n
Polytechnic College, 184
Pope, Fr. Hugh, 203, 217, 256n
  Europe and the Faith, 201, 259n
  on writing of history, 200
Popes :
  and Freemasonry, 207
  "Pope's word," 176
Port Royal, 27
Poynter, Mr. J. W., 183n, 187, 201—2, 203, 327n
Préalibert, M., 28
Prussia, 199, 293
Psalmist, the, 57, 76
Pugin, 58
Purcell, 226
  Life of Manning, 224
Putnam, Mr., 128—9
Pythagoras, 63

Rabelais, 124
Raphael, 191
Raphael, Archangel, 61
Rashdall, Dr. H., 329, 331
  Universities, 256n, 289n, 328
Ratgeb, Fr. Jacob, 243
Ravenna, Patriarchs of, 218
Ravignan, Père de, 148, 156, 162
Redemptionists, 76
Red Indians, 213
Renan, 139
Renard, Alphonse, 58, 175
Riccardi, Father, 63
Richardson, 124
Rickaby, Fr., 174, 296, 301ff
  Persecution, 294
Rifaux, Dr., 100, 143, 145, 157, 199
  Agonie du Catholicisme, 46, 100n
  Conditions du Retour au Catholicisme, 46, 113, 114, 158, 173, 186, 248n
Rigg, J. M., 58n, 66
Rinaldi, Father, 96
Riordan, M. V., 322
Robertson, Mr. J. M., M.P., 84
Rolfe, Frederick, 89n
  Hadrian the Seventh, 274
Romance countries, bishops of, 159
Rome, 5, 8, 64, 74, 89n, 152, 159, 161, 194, 200, 224, 234, 237, 259, 321, 346
  bishops of, 279
  Cardinal Vicar at, 186
  censorship at, 136
  clerical education at, 141, 165
  Collegio Nazareno at, 246
  conversions to, 172
  "the Devil's," 208
  Ecole de, 45
  as European State, 10
  "Rome has spoken," 259
  Houtin at, 39
  Monitore di Roma, 209
  papers in, 321
  Patriarch of, 259
  secessions from, 175, 204, 227, 245
  And see Narfon, Tyrrell
"Romanus," 127n, 128
Rose, Père, 143
Rossi, de, 237
Rottenburg, 346
  Bp. of, 266
Russell, Lord Odo, 224, 225
Russia, 148, 149, 343, 344
  And see Soviet
Ruyssen, 143
Ryder, Fr., 71n, 252, 253, 274, 275, 276

Sabatier :
  and Houtin, 37
  Life of St. Francis, 217
Salisbury, 169
Salisbury, John of, 118
Salmon, Dr. George, 9n, 17, 71, 112, 130n, 218
  Infallibility of the Church, 1
Salter, Mr. H. E., 328, 329, 331
San Antonio, Bp. of, 111
San Giuliano, Marchese di, 39
Sangnier, Marc, 25n
Sarepta, 30, 32

Satan, 199, 207, 209, 213, 216, 279
Satolli, Cardinal, 90
Saturn, 214
Schulte, J. F. v., 230, 237
  Altcatholicismus, 345n
  Die Stellung der Concilien, 231
Schuster, Dr., 197
Schwetz, 159
Scotland, 298
Scottish Church, 243
Scottish Reformation Society, 242
Ségur, M. de, 195
Sertillanges, Mgr., 143—4
Shakespeare, 187, 232
Shimei, 226
Shrewsbury, Bp. Singleton of, 178
Silurists, 213
Singleton, *see* Shrewsbury
Sion, Notre-Dame-de, 247
Sixtus V., Pope, 124
  Bible of, 229
Slesser, Sir Henry, 183n
Smith, Father, 306
Smith, Governor, 75, 76, 86, 92ff, 98, 113, Ch. VIII., 144, 270, 340
Socrates, 323
Solesmes, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 205
  Abbot Couturier of, 28
  Benedictines at, 30
Solomon, 170
Sorbonne, the, 5
Sorley, Dr. W. R., 303
Southwark, Bp. of, 52
Soviet, régime, 343
Spain, 130, 136, 149
  bishops of, and *Syllabus,* 96
  Freemasons in, 207
  Infallibility Decree in, 159
  Jesuits in, 168, 244
  Newspapers in, 227
  Philip II. of, 199
  religious education in, 188
  seminaries in, 25
Spalding, Abp., 90, 105
Sparrow-Simpson, Canon, 3n, 4n, 13n, 71n, 72, 146, 147n, 153, 234n
  R.C. opposition to Papal Infallibility, 1
Spencer, Herbert, 124
Steinhuber, Card., 60
Sterne:
  Tristram Shandy, 124
Stillman, Mr., 219 and note, 233, 319
Stoppani, Antonio. 58
Streicher, Father, 168
  Diary of an Indian Journey, 168
Strickland, Lord, 202, 310, 311
Strossmayer, 10, 345
Stuarts, 206
Sulpicians, 20, 21, 22, 34
Swiss and Taxil's works, 210
Switzerland, 125
Sydney, 239
St. Alfonso Liguori, 276
St. Andrew's, 242
St. Augustine, 229, 230, 257, 259, 282
  Ep. Ad Vincentium, 230
St. Bernard, 342
  on Immaculate Conception, 8
St. Bernardino of Siena, 282—3, 292
St. Bonaventura, 169
St. Catharine ot Alexandria, 174
St. Catharine of Siena:
  Dialogue, 271—2
St. Cyprian, 253, 256
St. Cyr, College of, 184
St. Francis to Dante, From, 181
St. Gall, Bp. of, 346
St. George, 191, 208
St. Gregory the Great, 118, 342
St. Gregory's Monastery, Downside, 286
St. Ignatius Loyola, 110
St. Irenæus, 230
St. Jerome, 253
St. Joseph, hospital of, 145

St. Luke, 230
St. Mark, Lion of, 216
St. Matthew, 24n
St. Paul, 38, 119, 170, 228
  Epistles of, 1
St. Paul (America), Abp. of, 89
St. Peter, 2, 119, 208
  claims of, 1
  primacy of, 230—1
St. Philumena, 218
St. René, *see* Angers
St. Simon Stock, 112, 113
St. Stephen, 253
St. Sulpice, 162
St. Teresa a Jesu, 136
St. Thomas Aquinas, 14, 69, 92n, 120n, 142, 152, 169, 183n, 203, 229, 246, 256, 287, 332, 339, 348
  "the Angelic Doctor," 152
  and Infallibility, 256
  Society of, 292
  Summa Theologica, 119n, 174, 230
St. Vincent de Paul, Société de, 148

Taine:
  History of English Literature, 124, 217
Tarascon, Tartarin of, 21, 208
Tarentaise, Bp. Lacroix of, 39, 240
Tarquini, Cardinal, 86
Tartarin, *see* Tarascon
Taunton, 244
Taxil, Léo, 26, 184n, 204, Ch. XV., 219, 223
  Frère Trois-Points, 210, 212,
  Thurston on, 223
Territorials, 85n
Texas, 111
Thiers, 2
Thorold, Mr. Algar, 271, 272
Thureau-Dangin, M., 44, 143
Thurston, Fr. Herbert, 297ff, 338—9
  No Popery, 223
Thurston, Fr. Herbert—*contd.:*
  Some Inexactitudes of Mr. G. G. Coulton, 300
Tixeront, Abbé, 143
Tobit, 61
Tocqueville, De, 193
Toledo, 228
Torquemada, 199
Tosti, Padre:
  The Conciliation, 233
Tout, Professor, 299
Trent:
  Anti-Masonic Congress at, 215
  Council of, 51, 61, 163, 181, 183, 203, 265, 268, 327n
Trevelyan, Mr. G. M., 297
Trèves, 5
Troyes, Bp. of, 80
Turmel, Abbé, 38, 143, 144 and note, 153
Tuy, Lucas of, 257
Tyrol, Italian, 48
Tyrrell, Father George, 40, Ch. IV., 83, 89, 110, 115, 138, 200, 275
  Autobiography of, 55
  and censorship system, 141
  on clerical education, 165
  and *Corrispondenza Romana,* 241
  and espionage, 148
  and Houtin, 56
  on Jesuits, 155, 156, 159, 304
  Newman's influence on, 55—6
  and *Pascendi,* 48, 247
  on "the Prison," 116, 172
  on reasons for secession, 175

Ullathorne, Bishop, 52
Ultramontanes, 1, 28, 146, 165, 265, 309, 344
  Bp. Gore on, 254
  Duchesne and, 45
  and Dreyfus case, 220
  and history, 308, 310
  And see Goetz

Urban IV., Pope, 256
Urban VIII., Pope, 141n

Vacandard, Abbé, 141n, 143, 144
Valence, Bp. of, 238
Valroger, Père Hyacinthe de, 164
Vandervelde, M. Emile, 222
Varagine, Jacobus de:
  Golden Legend, 218
Vatican:
  and Dreyfus case, 219
  "Italian bishopkins" at, 9
  and Mivart, 59
  and Taxil's works, 210
  and Tosti, 234
  And see Butler.
  Councils, Ch. I., 16, 17, 51, 61, 66, 72, 73, 125n, 146, 164, 181, 203, 224—6, 255, 257—8, 265, 267, 345—6
  Decrees, 230, 267
  Library, 193, 194, 195
    (Gasquet and), 281
Vaughan, Cardinal-Archbishop, 47, 57, 65, 128, 293
  and Mivart, 60
Vaughan, Diana, 184n, 204, 206, 213, 214, 219
Vaughan, Henry, 213
Vaughan, Mgr. J. S.:
  Faith and Folly, 293
Venice, Doge of, 235
Vermeersch, 86
Vernon, Fr., 335
Veuillot, Louis, 319, 324
  influence of, 320
Victorian sceptics, 328
Vienna, 159
Vigouroux, 231
Viollet, Paul, 47, 100, 101, 143, 144, 146, 219
Virgin Mary, 112, 189, 209, 214, 228, 317
  Immaculate Conception of, 8
  and Loretto, 238
Vitelleschi, Marchese, 39
Vöglein, Mgr., 209
Vogüé, Melchior de, 143
Volstead Act, 127
Von Hügel, 48

Waldensians, 260
Walder, Sophia, 213
Wales, 298
Wales, Prince of, 207
Walker, Fr. Leslie, 298n, 301, 302, 303, 305
Ward, B.:
  Eve of Cath. Emancipation, 319
Ward, Wilfrid:
  on Galileo, 62
  Life of Newman, 55, 95n, 115n, 133n, 134n, 161n, 171, 192
  and Loisy, 46
  on R.C. scholarship, 146
Ward, W. G., 164n
  on censorship, 139—40
  on seminary education, 161, 166
Ware, St. Edmund's College at, 161, 314
Washington, School of St. Augustine near, 34
Waterfield, Mrs.:
  Home Life in Italy, 169, 188
Wegg-Prosser, Mr., 62
Wellington, Bp. of 239
Westminster, 271, 273
  Gazette, 239
  Penny Catechism, 73, 181, 282, 283, 292
  Cath. Federation. 310
Whitehouse, Dr., 191
Whiting, Abbot, 337
Whitney, Professor, 299
Wiseman, Cardinal, 154, 276
Woodlock, Father, 16
  on Infallibility, 70
Workman, Dr., 299
Wright, Fr. John, 315
Wyclif, 280
Wycliffite Scriptures, 280
  Gasquet on 278
Wynandstrade, 198

Yale, 167
Yorkshire, 52
  Post, 305

Zahm:
  Evolution and Dogma, 64
Zola, 247
Zulueta, Prof. de, 112

Faith House THE STAMP OF EFFICIENCY **Faith House**

"NOT ONLY WITH OUR LIPS."

By the REV. BERNARD M. HANCOCK.

Paper 2/-. Cloth 3/-.

Church Times:—"A plain yet carefully worked-out set of lectures on the intelligent use of the Book of Common Prayer, such as this, is of great value in encouraging people to worship better."

THE VERACITY AND VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By the REV. JAMES STEPHENSON, B.D.

Paper 2/6. Cloth 3/6.

Church Times:—"Mr. Stephenson knows the way to present this knowledge in the form which ordinary readers require. He writes clearly and convincingly, without overburdening his reader with too much technical information, and he has done good service to religion by the publication of this book."

SOMETIME IN VISION.

The Witness of the Saints.

By GERALDINE HODGSON. Paper 1/-. Cloth 2/-.

Church Times:—"A brilliant piece of work on the part of a distinguished student. Dr. Hodgson has the mystics at her finger tips, and knows well the most striking passages to quote. She has done a great service in sending us to the classical masters in the school of prayer."

VERBI MINISTERIUM.

An introduction for Anglican Preachers.

By the REV. CANON J. E. W. WALLIS, M.A., with a Foreword by the BISHOP OF BLACKBURN. Cloth 3/-.

ARTIFEX in the *Manchester Guardian:*—"Of books on how to preach there is no end, but the Vicar of Whalley has added a really good one to the number already existing. Canon Wallis knows his subject, and the adjectives which suggest themselves as one reads it are 'practical' and 'exhaustive.' Again and again as I read it I wanted to say 'Hear, hear.'"

PUBLISHED BY
THE FAITH PRESS, LTD.,
AT 22 BUCKINGHAM STREET, CHARING CROSS, W.C. 2.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
THE FAITH PRESS, LTD., LEIGHTON BUZZARD.

Date Due

~~26 49~~
~~OC 21 49~~
2 50
~~OCT 2 2 2011~~

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01145 2150